DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 088 FL 014 885

AUTHOR Garcia, Maryellen; Leone, Elizabeth
TITLE The Use of Directives by Two Hispanic Children: An Exploration in Communicative Competence.
INSTITUTION National Center for Bilingual Research, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO NCBR-R-25
PUB DATE Apr 84
CONTRACT 00-CA-80-0001
NOTE 99p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Bilingual Research at SWRL, 4665 Lampson Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingualism; Case Studies; *Communicative Competence (Language); Comparative Analysis; English; *Mexican Americans; *Persuasive Discourse; Spanish; *Young Children

ABSTRACT

The display of Spanish and English communicative competence of two Hispanic children is explored in a study analyzing directive speech acts (orders, requests, suggestions, hints). The linguistic, sociolinguistic, and strategic resources of the Mexican-American children, aged 4-1/2 to 6 years, are examined qualitatively in data taken from naturalistic tape recordings made in their homes and school classrooms. The data show that the language in which the child has the most grammatical competence is also the language in which communicative competence in issuing directives is best demonstrated. Sociolinguistic and strategic competence appear to compensate for the lack of grammatical competence in the weaker language. Examples from the data indicate that these bilingual Hispanic children know a variety of directive types in Spanish and English by the age of six. Confirming what previous studies have shown, these children tend to use the direct imperative with peers and siblings, and inferred and indirect requests with adults or children whose special favor they seek. The issue of communicative performance is also explored, with particular attention to how the circumstances of the speech act may mitigate against the child's demonstration of communicative competence. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254088

THE USE OF DIRECTIVES BY TWO HISPANIC CHILDREN: AN EXPLORATION IN COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

by Maryellen Garcia
with the assistance of Elizabeth Leone

This paper will be available from the NCBR in the NCBR Report series, No. R-25. This revised draft was written in 1984, based on a presentation in 1983 (see title page for full information).

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL014885

national center for bilingual research, 4665 lampson avenue, los alamitos, CA 90720, telephone (213) 598-0481

The material in this publication was prepared under Cooperative Agreement 00-CA-80-0001 from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Education or of any other agency of the United States government, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

ABSTRACT

The display of communicative competence in the Spanish and English of two Hispanic children is explored in this paper in an analysis of directive speech acts, i.e., orders, requests, suggestions, hints, etc. The linguistic, sociolinguistic, and strategic resources of the Mexican-American children, aged 4 1/2 to 6 years, are examined qualitatively in data taken from naturalistic tape recordings made in their homes and school classrooms.

The data show that the language in which the child has the most grammatical competence is also the language in which communicative competence in issuing directives is best demonstrated. Sociolinguistic and strategic competence appear to compensate for the lack of grammatical competence in the weaker language. Examples from the data indicate that these bilingual Hispanic children know a variety of directive types in Spanish and English by the age of six. Confirming what previous studies have shown, these children tend to use the direct imperative with peers and siblings, and inferred and indirect requests with adults or children whose special favor they seek. The issue of communicative performance is also explored, with particular attention to how the circumstances of the speech act may mitigate against the child's demonstration of communicative competence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The cooperation of Angelina Veyna-Lopez, fieldworker for RT, is gratefully acknowledged. Additionally, comments and edits from Amado Padilla and Victor Rodriguez were helpful in the revision of this monograph.

THE USE OF DIRECTIVES BY TWO HISPANIC CHILDREN: AN EXPLORATION IN COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE*

by Maryellen Garcia
with the assistance of Elizabeth Leone

1.0 Rationale and Focus

Previous research on the communicative competence of the bilingual Hispanic child has tended to focus on the selection of Spanish or English as appropriate situationally (e.g., Fantini, 1978; Zentella, 1978; Garcia, 1980; McClure, 1981), the appropriateness of a linguistically integrated code-switching style given bilingual interlocutors from the same community (e.g., Genishi, 1976; McClure, 1977; Zentella, 1981, 1982; Olmedo-Williams, 1981), and the productive use of one language while tutoring a peer in the skills of another (Carrasco, Vera and Cazden, 1981). Research on the performance of speech acts by Hispanic bilingual children in one or both languages has usually been treated tangentially as part of a more broadly focused study (e.g., Fantini, 1976:118; Carrasco, Vera and Cazden, 1981:246), with the notable exception of Walters (1978; 1980).

The importance of the analysis of speech acts in one or both languages of the bilingual child's repertoire is underscored by the original formulation of the notion of communicative competence.

*This paper has been expanded by the first author from an earlier paper, co-authored by Elizabeth Leone, presented at the conference, El Español en Los Estados Unidos IV: La Investigación Comprometida, held at Hunter College, CUNY, October 7 & 8, 1983. The analysis of data section in this expanded version remains largely unchanged from the earlier version.

Communicative competence refers to the knowledge of not only the rules for the grammatical production of the language, but also for the socially and culturally appropriate use of a language given the circumstances in which a speaker interacts with a hearer (c.f. Campbell and Wales, 1970; Hymes, 1972). The objects of study in such situations are not the surface elements of the utterances of the speaker per se, but the speech acts which have social outcomes for the speaker. Briefly, a speech act is an utterance which performs a social act above and beyond that of uttering a string of words. One classic example is the fact that saying, "I now pronounce you man and wife," counts as the act of marrying a couple, if the person saying it is empowered to perform marriages. There are, of course, much less ritualized types of speech acts that are performed routinely, such as promising, objecting, apologizing, complaining, for example, which allow the speaker to carry on the social tasks of everyday life. The appropriate performance of speech acts is culturally determined; that is, the words, attitudes, gestures, tone of voice, and so on, which are used to perform a particular speech act in one culture may not be appropriate to the same task in another culture.

A more recent discussion of the theory of communicative competence suggests that it should include, minimally, three main competencies: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence (Canale and Swain, 1980). Grammatical competence includes knowledge of lexical items, and the rules of morphology, syntax, sentence grammar semantics, and phonology. This is also referred to as

linguistic competence. Sociolinguistic competence is comprised of knowledge of the sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse. These two types of rules account for the interpretation of utterances for social meaning, especially when the literal meaning does not closely match the speaker's intended message. Sociocultural rules of use specify how utterances are appropriate or inappropriate within a given social and cultural context. Knowledge of the rules of discourse involves the interrelationship of utterances, especially the rules for cohesion and coherence, to convey specific communicative functions in a given context. Strategic competence is exemplified by the verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that a speaker may use when breakdowns in communication occur due to performance variables, insufficient linguistic competence, or insufficient sociolinguistic competence.

With this characterization of the components of communicative competence, it is easy to see that Spanish-speaking English language learners must acquire a complex combination of behaviors in order to function successfully in their second language and culture. The fact that Hispanic children have the task of developing these linguistic, sociolinguistic, and strategic skills in their first language as well as in English--before these competencies in their home language may be fully developed--raises questions of how communicative competence is demonstrated by bilingual children. That is, do the components emerge first in one language and then in the other? Does linguistic competence in one language necessarily precede sociolinguistic

competence in that language? Can strategic competence in fact, compensate for limitations in linguistic and sociolinguistic ability in the weaker language of bilingual speakers? Questions about the communicative competence of bilingual children are further complicated by the fact that the sociocultural context for the use of both languages is often a single speech community, and the interlocutors with which one practices the second language may be bilingual but not, in fact, bicultural. Investigative exploration into the constituent components of the emerging communicative competence of the Hispanic child in both Spanish and English is needed so that questions of how bilingual children begin to approximate adult communicative competence in each language might be addressed in the future.

The linguistic, sociolinguistic and strategic resources that two Hispanic bilingual children have at their disposal to display their communicative competence in Spanish and English is of interest in this paper in one particular kind of speech act, the directive. A directive is an utterance in which a speaker orders, requests, or otherwise verbally influences a hearer to perform a desired action. Directives were chosen because they occur frequently in naturalistic interaction and, more importantly, because the act of influencing another to carry out one's own wishes calls for a great deal of sophistication. At the very least, adult competence requires that the utterance be appropriately deferential to the addressee, and attuned to the circumstances of the requesting. These factors depend on the speaker's manipulation of the linguistic form of the directive such that it will be interpreted

as a reasonable request for action in the social and cultural context in which it is uttered.

In this look at communicative competence, the linguistic resources of two Mexican-American children, aged 4 1/2 to 6 years, will be explored in terms of the repertoire of directive forms displayed by each of the children in Spanish and English. The sociolinguistic competence of the children in accomplishing directive speech acts in each language will be examined in a wide range of naturalistic contexts, including home and school settings. Additionally, the strategic abilities of the children will be illustrated in discourse segments which are directive in nature.

To foreshadow the conclusions of this study, evidence will be presented from each of the children to show that the language in which the child is the most fluent linguistically, i.e., on the basis of sentence-level data, will also be the language in which communicative competence in the area of directives is first demonstrated. What Canale and Swain call sociolinguistic competence (1980:30) will be shown to compensate for the lack of sentence-level linguistic competence in the weaker language, and the children will be shown to be effective in their directives in the weaker language for reasons which are social and situational rather than linguistic. As an important aside to the basic issue of communicative competence, the issue of communicative performance, i.e., what is said and done in actual speech situations (c.f., Canale and Swain, 1980:7), will be illustrated insofar as the children show themselves to be effective to a greater or

lesser degree under differing circumstances. Factors such as the children's perception of personal status vis-a-vis their interlocutors, the degree to which the directive imposes on the addressee, and the familiarity of the setting, will influence the performance of directive speech acts and may mitigate against the children's demonstration of competence in the actual situation.

2.0 Literature Review

A number of researchers have begun to look at questions regarding directive speech acts. Of primary interest is how adult competence is approximated by young children, and the inevitable conclusions that, while children have many of the components of future adult competence, they do not apply the rules of deference and politeness in the formulation of directives as adults do. Much of this research has been with children from monolingual English-speaking populations, usually middle-class. Approaches have included both experimental situations and more or less naturalistic interaction recorded in settings familiar to the children; the questions have usually centered around discovering the various situational factors that are relevant in the children's relative politeness--or lack thereof--in the formulation of requests. The work on bidialectal and Spanish-English bilingual populations has been little to date, and each study is made more important because of that scarcity. In this section, a review of the literature on children's use of directives in both monolingual English speaking and bilingual Hispanic populations will be presented.

Studies of monolingual English-speaking children. In James' (1978) experimental study, the age of the listener was controlled, as was the nature of the requesting situation, to determine their effect on the politeness of children's directives. The 21 children were aged 4;6 to 5;2 years, with a mean age of 4;9, and were from a nursery school in a middle- to upper-middle-class community. The 9 boys and 12 girls were audiotaped in a room at their nursery school. Each was in several sessions in which he or she was asked to give either a request or a command to one of three dolls representing an adult, peer and younger child. There were eight role-playing situations per addressee, four in the request situation and the other four in the command situation. In the former the speaker wanted or needed something from the addressee, and asked a favor of him or her, and in the latter the listener was said to have infringed on the speaker's rights in some way and the speaker ordered him to stop. A politeness scale for the children's utterances was derived by having 40 adults perform paired comparison ratings of 14 directive types used by the children.

The results showed that neither the sex of the speaker nor the listener affected the politeness of the directives, nor was there an interaction of sex of subject and listener, so data were collapsed across these factors. Interestingly, the mean politeness values for the directives increased in relation to listener age in both situations, and the mean politeness values for the request situations were higher than for the command situations. There were significant differences in the politeness of the directives addressed to all three

different-aged listeners in the command situation, and a significant difference between the politeness shown to adults versus younger children in the request situations. Three different directive forms were identified as distinguishing levels of politeness: interrogative, modified imperative, and the direct imperative. In the request situations, the children were found to use interrogative forms most frequently, regardless of listener; in the command situations interrogatives were used most frequently when addressing adults. The direct imperative was used most often with the younger child, with the peer receiving modified imperatives most frequently. "Please" was the lexical item used most frequently to show deference; across the two types of situations, it was used 84% with the adult and 37% of the time with the younger listener.

In her discussion of the results, James points out the interesting interaction between situation and listener in the request situations. Not only did the children become more polite in the request situation than in the command situation, but they also increased politeness differentially for the three listeners (p. 315). James suggests that ". . . the status of the peer and younger child increased in the request situations where the children had to ask a favor. The children placed themselves in an inferior position and their listeners in a superior position in the status relationship by giving the listener the power to grant or deny a favor." While James later refrains from claiming that this is evidence of reliance on a rule of adult politeness proposed by Lakoff (1973), i.e., Don't impose, it does,

nevertheless, serve to underscore the fact that deference may not be accorded solely on the basis of the age and status of the addressee, but on the basis of the nature of the request as well.

Another experiment with monolingual English speaking children is reported by Read and Cherry (1978). They sampled 15 children in the age groups 2 1/2, 3 1/2, and 4 1/2 to examine the range of forms which they had in their repertoires for issuing directives. The children were all females from middle class, professional families. They were either video- and/or audiotaped in a familiar setting, i.e., their homes or nursery school. The authors wanted to test the following hypotheses: 1) that the number of different directive forms produced by the older and younger children would not be significantly different; 2) that the older and younger children would differ as to the type of directive forms used most frequently, i.e., the younger subjects tending more toward gestural directives, and the older ones producing more modal directives. Both groups were hypothesized to produce the same number of declarative sentences, want/need statements, and "please" with directive function, as those appeared to be early forms.

The experimental task entailed making repeated requests to the popular children's television puppet personality, Cookie Monster. The experimenters set up an elicitation situation wherein the child's initial request for a crayon, juice, or a cookie would be denied by the Cookie Monster the first and second times a request was made, giving up the item only after the third request. The researchers coded for gestures, the imperative, the embedded imperative, and the lexical item

"please" as different directive types. The results of this experiment indicate that there is an absence of a developmental trend in the use of different directive forms (as identified in the coding), leading to the conclusion that the 2 1/2 year-olds know as many directives strategies as 4 1/2 year-olds. However, the number of gestural directives decreased with age, and the number of embedded directives increased with age. Older preschool children were not found to produce fewer direct imperatives than younger children; similarly, the older and younger children were found to produce the same number of declaratives, want/need statements, and "please" directives. Read and Cherry discount the apparent developmental trend away from the use of want/need directives by older children, although the three group means would suggest such a conclusion.

Read and Cherry use this data to support the claim that children from 2 1/4 to 4 1/4 years of age ". . . possess extensive and flexible repertoires of directives forms (p. 242)." (However, this assertion would be better qualified by noting the middle-class SES of this group of children.) They point out that preschool children alternate and recombine different directive forms spontaneously when initial directives fail to elicit listener compliance. They also feel it is important to note that the older children were less likely than the younger children to use gestures, but more likely than the younger children to use both the embedded imperative and the imperative forms in issuing directives. They, themselves, point out the incongruity of being polite to the Cookie Monster. The children were, perhaps,

sensitive to the fact that this character is not himself polite, and so did not enlist particularly polite strategies in obtaining objects from him. When the children did change their initial tactic in order to get compliance, they opted for being more explicit rather than more polite. However, the authors' overall conclusion about the effect of age on the production of directives is that children aged 4 1/2 produce longer directives and spontaneously expand their utterances to encompass several directive forms, resulting in directives which are more explicit without relinquishing politeness. They urge the examination of both explicitness and politeness in future studies of directives by children.

An experimental study by Bock and Hornsby (1981) examines the ability of children between the ages of 2 1/2 to 6 1/2 to distinguish the directive senses of ask and tell. They propose that ask authorizes the request mode, wherein the speaker does not have authority over the addressee, and that tell authorizes the command mode, which is more appropriate where the speaker does have authority over the addressee. They hypothesize that children instructed to ask should be more polite than those instructed to tell. A second purpose of their study is to compare the range of syntactic forms of the utterances chosen for each type of directive.

Their subjects were 128 children in nursery schools in Oregon. There were 32 children in each of four age groups: 3, 4, 5, 6. The experimental task included an adult and a child addressee, and the subject and an adult experimenter. The children were brought to a room

adjoining their nursery school classroom for the task of assembling a puzzle with the help of the other child and an adult. Both had been given different pieces of a wood puzzle, each depicting a different object. The variables manipulated were 1) verb and 2) addressee. Thus, the child was told to ask for a puzzle piece or to tell the addressee to give it to them. One half of the children in each age group received ask, the other, tell. Each child issued 16 directives. The relevant factors were: age of child, sex of child, ask versus tell, and adult versus child addressee. The dependent measures were 1) the politeness of the directives as determined by adult ratings, 2) the frequency of the use of "please," and 3) the syntactic form of the directives, i.e., imperative, interrogative, or declarative. Each directive was rated by 30 adult judges on a five-point scale, with the higher numbers reflecting greater politeness. The results indicated that the judges felt interrogatives to be the most polite form, with no difference between declaratives and imperatives. Requests in the ask condition were rated as more polite than requests in the tell condition.

In the discussion of the results, the authors note that children become more polite when instructed to ask than to tell, and there is a greater trend toward politeness developmentally with ask but not with tell. The politeness form "please" was more likely under the ask condition than under the tell condition. Children used more imperatives under the tell condition than with ask. Also, there was a greater use of interrogatives under ask than tell across age groups.

They suggest that this may reflect a greater ability of the older children to use the syntax of questions, and an increasing compliance with the demands of polite behavior where it is called for. The declaratives (for the most part consisting of want/need statements), were employed more by the younger children. It was not the case in their data that younger children tended to over-employ the direct imperative. Over 56% of the corpus from the youngest group of subjects were interrogatives and declaratives. The use of the imperative did not change significantly with age, but there was an age trend toward the increased use of the interrogative in both instruction conditions. Further, children reduced their use of declaratives more in the tell condition than with ask. There was an absence of an overall difference between the syntactic forms used with adults and children. The authors felt that the fact that the adult and child were both performing the same simple task might have been responsible for this. So, this experiment may have underestimated the children's ability to differentiate requesting strategies between adults and children. They conclude that children do, indeed, differentiate the use of requests on the basis of understanding the illocutionary forces behind the use of ask and tell, and they get better at it with age.

Naturalistic studies. Studies which look at children's production of directives using naturalistic data, while eliminating the artificiality of an elicitation situation, are constrained by the choice of naturalistic speech situations sampled. In one often-cited study, Garvey (1975) looked at 36 children from white, middle class

professional families who were all from the same nursery school. There were 21 girls and 15 boys, ranging in age from 3;6 to 5;7. The speech situation was set up by the researchers to encourage free play in a room equipped with one-way mirrors, through which the play of two children at time was videotaped. After 15 minutes, a new dyad was created. The activities around which the directives centered included the exploration of the room, which had been outfitted with toys, the children's pretend play, and related conversation. The dyads were matched by age, so that there were 12 dyads of younger children (aged 3;6 to 4;4) and 24 dyads of older children (aged 4;7 to 5;7). The result was a large corpus of spontaneous speech with peers, free of adult influence. The total number of utterances Garvey considered as well-formed directives, i.e., addressed to a real peer rather than to an imaginary playmate, was 565.

Before discussing some of her findings, it is worthwhile here to introduce some of the concepts which she introduces to the study of children's directives. First is her separation of different directive types (or, request types, as Garvey prefers to categorize these speech acts). These are distinguished on the basis of the speaker's explicitness in naming the action to be performed, and the person to carry out the action. This results in three categories: direct requests, indirect requests, and inferred requests. The former category is the most explicit, being in the imperative mode or using a performative verb, e.g., I order you to clean your room. The next type is less linguistically explicit, although such directives

conventionally carry the force of a request by mentioning the desired action and doer, e.g., Could you clean you room? The latter are the least explicit, and may imply but do not state the desired action and doer, e.g., How can you live in this mess? Also important to Garvey was whether the intended illocutionary effect (IIE) of the request is achieved, i.e., if the hearer is aware that the speaker has made a request. (The intended perlocutionary effect (IPE) is achieved if the hearer complies.)

Garvey also proposes a structural unit in which to discuss the request. She suggests that each request has its own domain, i.e., ". . . the scope of discourse within which the attention of the speaker and addressee is directed to the accomplishment of the request (1975:49)." The moves that occur under the domain of the request is its role structure. The role structure accounts for the different contingencies of the request once it is made, as it indicates the expected sequence of complimentary behaviors under both normal circumstances and those where difficulties might arise. The obligatory components of the role structure of the request are the speaker's (S) initial request (II see Figure 1) and the hearer's (H) acknowledgement of it (IV see Figure 1). The other components are optional.

---

insert Figure 1 about here

The proposed role structure for requests allows the researcher a template against which to compare instances of directive discourse from

naturalistic data, given that circumstances that exist at the time of an actual request may not allow the request to be immediately complied with. Insofar as the template allows for predictions of the way the discourse may flow after a request is issued, it is of particular interest in the examination of the communicative competence of L2 English language learners, whose set of expectations about discourse are most likely to be formed on appropriateness rules in their native language.

Garvey suggests that, ". . . learning to produce discourse can be understood as learning to perform the component behaviors which contribute to the successful execution of speech acts, learning the relative order of these behaviors, and learning the appropriate distribution of roles which the alternating turns of the act domain require (p. 51)." So the single utterance is inadequate as the unit of analysis for directive speech acts. That unit is more properly identified as the discourse falling under the entire request domain. This approach provides a basis for considering communicative competence in the production of directives to be a discourse-based notion rather than a sentence or utterance-based notion.

Rather than report clear-cut results, Garvey presents interpretations of the data on a number of dimensions, only a few of which can be reflected here. First, it is interesting to note that 270 of the 565 well-formed requests directed to peers were direct requests, i.e., the direct imperative. Out of 75 episodes that could have been indirect requests, only 67 were accepted as such on the criterion that

the hearer acknowledged the speaker's request to perform the action. The younger dyads were responsible for 15 of the 67, and the older dyads were responsible for 52 of the 67. The total number of possible inferred requests used by the children were excluded from consideration, as, by definition, they failed to specify a hearer or an action in the propositional content of the utterance. However, the definite likelihood that inferred requests occurred in this corpus was suggested by two types of episodes: 1) the expression of need or desire on the part of the speaker which is interpretable as a request, e.g., I want the car, and, 2) pretend statements which often worked in obtaining a desired goal, e.g., Pretend this was our car.

The role structure of the request, delimited as the domain of the initial request, also reflects certain critical beliefs about requesting, e.g., that there is a reason for the request, that the hearer is the appropriate person to carry out the request, etc. (Garvey, p.52). It is through the examination of the request domain that indications of these critical beliefs become apparent. Garvey calls the critical beliefs associated with requests the meaning factors of the request. The children's direct and indirect requests and their responses support the hypothesis that children are aware of the meaning factors associated with requests. Direct requests were used both by younger and older dyads, who were both equally as successful in achieving their goals. Fewer indirect requests were produced, with the older dyads producing twice as many as the younger dyads. However, younger dyads as well as the older dyads were observed to express

meaning factors relevant to requests in other parts of the role structure, e.g., adjuncts, acknowledgements, and repeated requests, which indicates that the younger children were as aware of the meaning factors as the older children. Another important claim made by this study is that speakers and hearers (even young children) share an understanding of how the beliefs and attitudes that are part of a speaker's social competence are encoded in their language. Thus, the request, as a speech act, reflects an intersection of social and linguistic competence (p. 62).

Dore (1977) conducted a pragmatic analysis of children's responses to questions in data taken from naturalistic interaction between 7 subject children, their peers and teacher. There were 4 boys and 3 girls of middle class SES in nursery school participating in the study, within an age range of 2:10 to 3:3. They were videotaped over a seven month period for two hours a week in their nursery school room in a wide variety of situations, including snacktime, arts and crafts time, and free play. The teacher was as "unobstrusive as possible" regarding the child-initiated activities. The children's spontaneous speech in these situations was sampled in videotapes taken from the last four months of taping. More than half of the 3,000 utterances were directed to peers.

The coding included a distinction between requests for action, wh- requests for information, and yes/no information requests. The responses were coded into the following groups 1) canonical, 2) non-canonical, 3) no answer, and 4) uninterpretable. The results show

that responses to wh- questions were of the informational type, i.e., canonical, in only 47% of the cases. Other wh- questions were responded to as requests for action, i.e., receiving responses relating to compliance. Responses to yes/no questions which were requests for action, e.g., Can you give me it?, were split, with more than half being non-canonical. Those questions which received no answer were functionally as well as formally equivocal. The 33 cases of yes/no questions which were grammatical tags usually followed utterances which could have been requests for action, e.g., He needs more room, okay? Of the non-canonical responses for these tag questions, 18 indicated compliance to a request for action. Although Dore's purpose was not that of studying requests for action per se, he did point out that the regulation of discourse concerns the rational organization of conversation, and that 37% of the wh- questions produced by the children served to make explicit a preparatory condition for request to be made.

Dore's study indicated that many times the form of the question is equivocal with regard to how it is to be interpreted in context, and the children's responses to these questions reflect the dual interpretation of the question. Dore's main concluding point for this study is to suggest ". . . a characterization of the contingency relations in children's question-response sequence as consisting of at least three general levels: grammatical agreement, discourse regulation, and conversational implications (p. 162)." That is, an answer to a

question can be a response to its linguistic form, to its function in the discourse, and to its pragmatic implications for action.

One of the few studies which does not use white, middle class children is that of Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan (1977). Their subjects are Black American children ranging in age from 7;1 to 12 years, so they are older than the children in the other studies discussed so far. This study uses children's role-playing with puppets as the speech activity from which they draw most of their data; the utterances are naturalistic only in the sense that the characters, situations, and story lines were created by the children. (Further, the authors point out that puppets themselves may have suggested themes and characters.) Additional data are drawn from the free play among the same subjects at their recreation center. This study seeks to explore "(a) the social distribution of directive types," and "(b) the relationship between particular directives and broader interactional goals (p. 191)." For their analysis, the authors use the classification scheme developed by Ervin-Tripp (1976; 1977) for adult directives, and display it to categorize their own examples (p. 192). The types are the following:

Type	Example
Need Statements	I want a green milkshake.
Imperatives	Be back here at three-o'clock
Imbedded Imperatives	John, would you tell that lady to quit?
Permission Directives	May I have the police?
Question Directives	Hey, you got a quarter, Mac?
Hints	I'm the seargent around here.

Although Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan do not go further into the factors that differentiate these requests, it should be fairly easy to equate these broad types to the direct (= Imperatives) indirect (= Imbedded Imperatives, Permission Directives), and inferred requests (= Need Statements, Question Directives, Hints) of Garvey (1975), presented earlier.

The number of directives obtained from their subjects (number undisclosed) was 261. Of those, 15 were in the form of a Need Statement. In role-play work settings, the data showed that these statements were addressed by persons of higher rank to those of lower rank, or addressed by customers or clients to someone whose role obliged compliance. In role-play family settings, statements were more often addressed from parent to child than vice-versa, as Ervin-Tripp (1976) had found. The most common type of directive in the role-playing data was the imperative, with over 200 instances. In the family situations, the majority of these (71%) were addressed to persons of equal status as the speaker, and one-quarter (24%) were addressed from higher ranking to lower ranking addressees. In the work settings, the majority (70%) were addressed by higher-ranking speakers to lower-ranking addressees, while speakers used the imperative with persons of equal rank next-most frequently (21%).

Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan report a total of 22 imbedded imperatives, i.e., those in which agent, verb, and object are explicit, but are introduced by forms such as, Why don't you, and Would you.

They note that 82% of these were used between interlocutors of equal rank. They feel that the role-playing situation would not allow for an assessment of the reasons for using this form with equals, but they do say that their ". . . data suggest that when aspects of the request are held constant, such as its difficulty, the absence of solidarity between speaker and addressee may be reflected in the favoring of imbedded imperatives over (direct) imperatives (p. 197)." They report that children who are temporarily on the "outs" with peer group members tend to use more imbedded imperatives and politeness forms such as "please." They suggest that directives with a higher 'cost' to the addressee also promote the use of the indirect imperative. For example, requesting another child to go to the store for the speaker was a fairly high cost request, and in one case was formulated as: Belinda, will you go to the store for me?

Also found in the data were 7 permission directives, which appear to ask the addressee permission to do something, but which are, in fact, requests for the addressee to act, e.g., May I have the operator, please? All were addressed to persons of equal rank. There three question directives, (Garvey's inferred requests), two being completely non-explicit, and one naming the desired object, e.g., Hey, you got a quarter, Mac? There were 14 hints which served as directives; most occurred in personal/family situations between interlocutors of equal rank (71%). The authors point out that in the role-play data, question directives and hints are used quite pointedly by the speakers to show that they expect to elicit a compliant response, as signalled by direct

address form, intonation, etc. However, they also point out that the children used inexplicit directives in their spontaneous interactions with the researchers given the very real possibility of a non-compliant response from them.

This study has much more to offer; only brief mention can be made of several interesting and worthwhile discussions. The authors point out that many of the directives in the role-playing situations were addressed from parent to child. The apparent function of these directives, which often occurred at the beginning of the role-play episode, was to establish a relationship of dominance-submission between the characters in the play. In observing the children's spontaneous speech in play activities, the researchers were ". . . struck by what appears to be an absence of strong social pressure toward civility within the peer group (p. 204)." For example, there was frequent non-compliance to low-cost requests the children made of each other, which were likely perceived as challenges to their status and to their rights. The authors also report that it was common for a child to use the direct imperative with the adult researchers, e.g., asking for favors such as, "Drive me home." The usual response from the adult would be non-compliance and a verbal comment as to the inappropriateness of the form of the directive. The children would usually then rephrase the directive to a more polite form.

In summary, the authors note that the children in their sample have acquired all of the conventional forms that directives may take in American English, and that they use all of the major types that are

described by Ervin-Tripp (1976, 1977). They also show an awareness of some of the social factors that help to determine which directive forms to use according to the occasion. The variety in directive forms displayed by the children, and the selection of an appropriate form on the basis of situational appropriateness, lead the authors to claim that these are components of the children's communicative competence with respect to the use of directives. Their choice of directive forms also enable the children to serve some their own interpersonal functions in the speech situation, i.e., the status striving that seems to be an essential part of the culture of the children examined here. Further, the authors suggest that the ambiguity of intent in the use of an imperative to an equal is quite a different question from the use of a pragmatically ambiguous form which may be interpreted either literally or directively. The question in the interpretive problem is one of the intentional focus of the speaker, i.e., whether what he wants to accomplish by the imperative is the action itself or a show of his/her power to get the addressee to perform the action.

The last of the naturalistic studies of directives by monolingual English speakers is that of Wilkinson, Calculator and Dollaghan (1982), who looked at first grade children in their reading groups. The purpose of the paper was to give a qualitative look at children's directness and choice of request form, their revision of requests when compliance was not achieved, and the effect that the revision had on compliance.

The authors report that previous research (Wilkinson and Calculator, 1980; Wilkinson and Spinelli, 1981) with first and third grade children has provided a data base of more than 3,600 requests and responses from 65 subjects, which allow certain general statements to be made about English-speaking children's use of requests. The children typically produced requests which were direct, sincere, and on-task, and were designated to a particular listener. They were shown to get compliance two-thirds of the time to their requests for action, and in those cases where compliance was not achieved, they revised their requests in two fifths of the cases. The children were found to be explicit, direct, and assertive, in contrast to adults, who are initially indirect and mitigate their revised requests when there is initial non-compliance.

In the study reported by Wilkinson, Calculator, and Dollaghan, the subjects were 45 first grade students in one school, divided into nine reading groups. There were six samples of group data for 30 children, and one sample of data for 15 children. There were between four to six subjects per reading group; other groups of students were occupied in the same classroom with other activities during the videotaping. the dominant activity of the reading group was reading, either silently or aloud. Other activities were the completion of worksheets, drawing illustrations, or printing sentences.

The utterances extracted were both requests for action and requests for information. Coded as direct action requests and information requests were: the imperative, yes/no questions, tag

questions, and wh- questions. Indirect requests were requests for action in the form of: the embedded imperative, want/need declarative, declarative with directive intent, sentences with modal verb, and non-lexical. Indirect requests for information were of the form: intonation question, declarative statement, and non-lexical. A revision was identified as the re-initiation of a request within three turns of the initial request; revisions were coded as either mitigated or aggravated. Responses were coded as compliance, in which the action or information or reason for lack thereof was provided; alternatively, non-compliance was coded, in which case the action or information was not provided or postponed.

The data base included 1,182 requests and their responses, with 535 requests for action, and 647 requests for information. The related responses which were non-compliant totaled 392, and there were 157 revisions. The focus of the analysis was the variation and complexity within the characteristics of: directness/indirectness, compliance/non compliance, and revision/non-revision. The authors found that first grade children were more likely to use direct forms for both types of requests, and that they were more likely to use aggravated revisions of initial requests. Even though direct forms were more frequent in the data, the 6 to 7 year olds were also found to use indirect forms, politeness terms, adjuncts, and referenced sincerity preconditions in their initial and revised requests. The children obtained compliance to both types of requests (i.e., action and information) about two-thirds of the time. In contrast to adults,

these data show that children often refuse to comply and do not provide a reason for non-compliance.

The authors suggest that the children's behavior with regard to producing and responding to requests for action and information is not that associated with adults. From an adult perspective, the children's use of language may qualify them as "communication delinquents" (p. 175). Their discussion of children's effective communication in first-grade illuminates the complex nature of knowledge that must underlie the abstract concept of communicative competence. The children's language behavior shows that the kind of knowledge needed for effectiveness and that needed for politeness may be at odds with each other.

The authors point out the apparent paradox between being direct and effective in requests, versus being indirect and potentially ineffective. With the former strategy, children make their intent known, but may be perceived as rude; with the latter strategy, the speaker gives the listener more options, but may not effectively communicate the request. They conclude that the functional aspects of communicative competence are incompletely developed when the child enters school, and that the child must subsequently develop the knowledge of language functions, contexts, and the rules for relating both of them.

Summary of monolingual English studies. The experimental studies discussed in this review taken together, seem to indicate that children as young as 2 1/2 (Read and Cherry, 1978) have an array of different

strategies for expressing directive intent, and that this knowledge of variant strategies does not change significantly through the age of 4 1/2 (Read and Cherry) or later, e.g., 5;2 (James, 1978) and 6 1/2 (Bock and Hornsby, 1981). The types of directive forms identified by these studies are gestures, the direct imperative, the embedded imperative, and "please," for the Read and Cherry study on the younger children; the interrogative, modified imperative, and the direct imperative in the study of the 4 1/1 to 5-year-olds (James, 1978); and the imperative, interrogative, or declaratives with the 2 1/2 to 6 1/2-year-olds in the Bock and Hornsby study (1981). The studies found that the level of deference expressed by older children was usually greater than that of younger children, and children developed from using gestures to the direct imperative, to the use of more modified imperatives, including interrogatives and politeness markers such as, "please." Further, older children would be more likely to expand and elaborate on their directives to ensure compliance. Other factors which appear to influence children's production of directives are the situation which necessitates one, e.g., whether the directive is a true request for a favor or an order to stop an imposition on rights. Also influencing the children's selection of politeness forms was the variable of the addressee, e.g., the adult versus younger addressees as portrayed by the dolls in the James study (1978), and the lack of politeness to the Cookie Monster in the Read and Cherry study (1978).

The apparent lack of deference in the Bock and Hornsby study was attributable to the fact that both addressees were receiving the same type of low cost request.

In the naturalistic studies on English-speaking children, we find that in peer-peer interaction, initial requests were most often very direct and assertive. Correspondingly the form used most frequently is the direct imperative. In the single study on ethnically different children by Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan (1972), this predisposition of children toward directness and apparent rudeness was carried one step further, with children refusing to comply with reasonable direct requests of other children in a show of status-related one-upsmanship. From Dore's study (1977) we find that the interpretation of requests for action that are syntactically equivocal may confuse younger children, i.e., under the age of 3 1/2, who may respond with information, with an action, or may not respond at all. This may be one reason for younger children's apparent reliance on the most direct form, i.e., the direct imperative, when issuing directives.

In all of the studies there was the theme that the ability to perform directive speech acts (including the discourse under the domain of the initial directive) appropriately to setting and addressee was a manifestation of communicative competence. It was the feeling of some that, while many of the linguistic elements that were necessary in order to convey directive intent were present in the repertoire of 4 to 5 year-olds, that adult strategies toward indirectness and mitigation of revised requests were not a property of children's communicative

competence, even at the first grade level. It was clear that there remained a great deal of questions to be answered before a clear picture would be revealed about the way that English-speaking children acquire adult communicative competence in the area of directive speech acts.

Studies of Spanish-English bilinguals. While there are a fair number of studies on monolingual English-speaking children, there are far fewer on the use of directives by Spanish-English bilingual children. The remainder of the review will discuss the handful of studies that deal with Spanish-speaking bilingual children.

In a case study of his own child's development in Spanish and English, Fantini (1976) noted that between the ages of two and four, the language that Mario used with peers was different from his speech style with adults. He usually used English with playmates. His speech to them featured many direct commands, expressive interjections, and onomatopoetic sounds. There was an almost complete absence of courtesy terms and diminutives. The commands to peers were usually unmitigated, e.g., Move!, Give me! Fantini reported the use of Mario's direct commands in English as early as age 3;4, with simple, formulaic utterances being characteristic of his output, e.g., Shut up! Don't do that!, My, my, not yours! A few other similar samples are given, encompassing age 3;4 to age 4;9. When not with peers, Mario would sometimes have imaginary dialogues with playmates, filled with aggressive statements. Fantini characterizes this style as ". . . often filled with conflict, power plays, attention seeking, possessive

behavior, and sometimes egocentric displays of indifference (p. 119)." He points out that the child-adult interplay did not display these characteristics.

Narvaez (1981) examined the use of requests by two bilingual nursery school children, a boy, Javier, and a girl, Blanca. The study sought to discover the immediate contextual variables of the child's request, i.e., addressee, language choice, and purpose, to discover how children accomplished requests across turns, and to discover how successful the children were in making their requests understood.

Narvaez was a participant-observer in a nursery school classroom in which she videotaped for a period of two months. For her analysis she considered two half-hour videotapes of interaction in the classroom. They were coded for request type, which included: requests for action, information, permission, and attention; speech pattern (one of four types which she identified); and language of the request, i.e., Spanish or English. She found that requests for action were the most frequent (55%), followed by requests for attention (29%), requests for information (11%), and requests for permission (5%). Most of the requests for permission and attention were directed to teachers. The other types of requests were directed primarily to peers. The children differed as to their language choice in peer-peer situations. Javier, who was less overtly aggressive than Blanca, used both Spanish and English equally in his requests for action (usually to peers), while he used English in his requests for information and attention (usually to teachers). Blanca, "a ringleader" in her female peer group, used

Spanish in her requests for action to peers and in her requests for information and permission (to teachers) but used both English and Spanish in her requests for attention. Both children were effective in making their requests understood, as 82% of Javier's and 81% of Blanca's requests received responses.

There were four discourse patterns found for requests which had been understood: 1) verbal request followed by a response; 2) a verbal request and a non-verbal response; 3) a verbal request and a delayed response (either verbal or non-verbal) 4) a verbal request and no apparent response. The first pattern accounted for 22% of the total requests in both languages to teachers and peers; pattern two accounted for 32% of the requests, usually in Spanish; pattern three was more characteristic of Spanish than English and not tabulated; and pattern four was least frequent (11%), occurring most frequently with teachers in English. Narvaez briefly talks about appropriate language choice as being a display of communicative competence, as children adjust the language of their requests to fit the particular social context and participants in the interaction.

The most ambitious study of directives by Spanish-English bilingual children is that of Walters (1978; 1981), who focuses on the range of children's linguistic variation in English and Spanish as a function of social context. He considered the different strategies that bilingual children had for conveying requests and how the deference displayed in the requests would vary as a function of five contextual factors: 1) male versus female subject; 2) adult versus

peer addressee; 3) male versus female addressee; 4) White versus Black addressee; 5) the setting and topic of the request (4 variables). He also compared the effect of the contextual variables on directives in L1, i.e., Spanish, on those effects in L2, i.e., English.

Walter's subjects were 32 children aged 7;7 to 11;4 with a mean age of 9;6. There were equal numbers of male and females. The majority of the children were from Puerto Rican backgrounds; the other three were of other Hispanic origin. The experimental task involved the child talking with a puppet who was his/her "friend," and matched his age, race, and sex. The puppet needed help in making requests of another puppet, which in each experiment was two of eight possible combinations of age (old/young), race (Black/White) and sex (male/female). There were four protocols in each language which varied as to setting. Within each setting, there was the opportunity for the child to produce two requests differentiated by topic. The settings or topics were: a supermarket, requesting lunch money, playing in the neighborhood, and selling cookies. There were two requests elicited in each setting: in the supermarket, requests were 1) to be shown the rice, and 2) to get ahead in the checkout line; in the lunch money situation, the requests were 1) asking for money in the cafeteria 2) asking for money in the school office; in the neighborhood play situation the requests were 1) that the addressee allow the speaker to play in his/her yard, and 2) to borrow a ball to play with; in the cookie selling situation, the requests were 1) for the addressee to buy some cookies, and 2) that the addressee sign a form. The request

strategies from the experiment in both languages were submitted to judges to get a continuum of deference. There were 14 request types identified in English and 12 identified in the Spanish data. There was a resultant rank order of the least to the most deferential. The variables identified for analysis of variance were: sex of speaker (m, f) setting (4 levels), age of addressee (older, younger), and race of addressee (White, Black).

The results for the English condition of the experiment were that the effect of setting was very strong with regard to level of deference, and that the sex of the addressee was also a strong factor, i.e., females received more deferent directives than males. There was a significant interaction between the sex of the addressee and the setting, i.e., males in the supermarket setting received the least level of deference. In the Spanish condition of the experiment, the effect of setting was strong, although not as strong as in the English condition. The sex of the addressee was also a strong factor, females receiving more deference than males. There was no apparent significant effect for sex of subject in the production of deferential requests.

Walters reports that there was overlap in the use of ten Spanish and English strategies, as illustrated below (Walters, 1978:88).

	English	Spanish
1)	You have to . . .	Tiene que
2)	Imperative	Imperative
3)	Where	Donde
4)	You + Verb	Usted tiene
5)	Do (e.g., you want)	Quiere

6)	May	Nos deja
7)	If	Si
8)	We can + Verb	Podemos
9)	Can you	Puede
10)	Can I	Me puede

It is interesting to note that, according to Walters, si was elicited twice as often in Spanish as English (p. 88), and podemos was produced more often than we can + Verb in English.

Walters concludes (in his 1978 treatment, p. 93), that setting and sex of the addressee contributed most to the variance in the deference in children's requests. The child's own sex and the race of the addressee had no apparent effect on strategies in English, and only the race of the addressee was important in Spanish, i.e., the children were more deferential to Blacks in that condition.

Finally, one study involving bilingual Hispanic children and naturalistic data also addresses the question of communicative competence with regard to directives in Spanish and Engish. Rodriguez-Brown and Elías-Olivares (1981) examined the spontaneous, naturalistic speech production of six Illinois third graders in classroom situations as well as informal play situations. The authors suggest that in order to demonstrate communicative competence in the area of directives, the children would have to be able to identify and comprehend utterances that had non-explicit directive forms, and to be able to select from a large repertoire those forms that were situationally appropriate to the context of interaction.

The six eight-year-olds were observed and videotaped in their bilingual classroom and in informal play situations with siblings and friends at home and together as a group at a picnic. The children had been deliberately selected on the basis of language proficiency for a study which involved language proficiencies in English and Spanish as dependent measures in a qualitative study of the relationship of language proficiency and language use in and out of school. Three children had high proficiency in English, as measured by the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) and the subjective judgements of the teacher, parents and researchers, and three had low proficiency in English. For the group with high English proficiency, one child had high Spanish proficiency, another had low Spanish proficiency, and the other had no Spanish proficiency. For the three with low English proficiency, two were judged to have high proficiency in Spanish, and the other to have low Spanish proficiency. Their directives were categorized into Ervin-Tripp's six types: Need Statements, Imperatives, Imbedded Imperatives, Permission Directives, Questions, and Hints.

The results of the directives analysis of the study were presented in terms of types of directives used in each setting in each language. Most of the directives were addressed to other children. Across the six children, 93 directive tokens were counted in English in the classroom setting, and 39 were produced in Spanish. The types of directives used in the classroom setting are presented in Figure 2.

---

insert figure 2 about here

It is interesting to note that the percentages of use of the direct imperative are very similar, accounting for 63.4 percent of the total in English and 69.2 percent of the total in Spanish. Further, the total number of imbedded imperatives are very close, accounting for 17.2 percent of the total in English and 25.6 percent of the total in Spanish. It might be surmised that Need Statements function differently in Spanish than in English in the classroom, as they account for 13.9 percent of the total in English and for none in Spanish. In contrast, the other types were used very seldom.

In informal settings, the six children used a total of 115 directives in English and 259 in Spanish. These totals are presented below in Figure 3.

---

insert figure 3 about here

In the English directives aggregation, only four of the six children used a type other than direct imperative. Those two who used only the direct imperative had low proficiency in English. In the aggregation of the Spanish directives in informal settings, only two children used more than one type, and one child accounted for 231 (89%) of the 259 tokens. In informal situations, it appears that children use the direct imperative to an even greater extent than in the classroom, 83.5 percent of the time in English, and 74.9 percent in Spanish. The use of the imbedded imperative, a more deferential form, decreases, with 11.3 percent use in English and 21.6 percent in Spanish. Need

Statement, Question Directives, and Hints are again found only infrequently.

The authors suggest that directives occur most often in the language in which the child is more proficient. The higher English proficiency students used a total of 93 directives in English, while students at lower English levels used only six. In Spanish, students at the lower levels used only 13 directives (in fact, all used by only one speaker), while children at the highest level used 26 directives in Spanish. Only the direct imperative was used in Enlgish by the lower English proficiency speakers.

The conclusion as to the linguistic repertoire of the six children in the area of directives is that all six of the children ". . . have receptive competence in all of the conventional forms" that directives take in English and Spanish (p. 84). This, however, is qualified by the fact that their productive competence is limited to a few forms, apparently the Imperative and Imbedded Imperative. Need Statements, Permission Directives, Questions, and Hints are used by only a few of the children in either English or Spanish. The authors explain that the production of the various directive forms ". . . varies according to the levels of language proficiency students possessed in each language" (p. 84). Developmental factors are suggested as possibly accounting for the low frequency of more complex types of directives. The low number of English or Spanish forms by students with low proficiency is also attributed to their relatively restricted opportunity to use their low-proficiency language in the context of the

classroom. As a pedagogical measure, the authors suggest giving the low-proficiency students an opportunity to mix with students at a higher proficiency in the second language, to help develop and/or maintain the weaker language.

Summary of bilingual studies. It appears that membership in children's peer groups are very important to the acquisition of a certain type of directive, i.e., the direct imperative, which surfaces at a very early age (c.f. Fantini's child). In the nursery school classroom examined by Narvaez, she finds that, not surprisingly, bilingual children make almost equal use of their two languages in making requests, and that requests for action are not only the most frequent of all types of requests, but are also most likely to be used with other peers than with teachers. Also, it is the case that approximately 80 percent of those requests for action are understood by child interlocutors, who, one may surmise, perhaps respond better to directness rather than indirectness. Walters' experimental study gives evidence that there are, in fact, a great deal of corresponding forms (or 'strategies') for directives across English and Spanish, which is of interest for the question of communicative competence transference across languages. Moreover, the Walters study attributes much of the variation in deferential forms to the sex of the addressee and setting or topic of the request itself, which leads to the expectation that situational factors do, indeed, have a great influence on directive form.

Finally, Rodriguez-Brown and Elías-Olivares' study of the use of directives by third grade Hispanic children in home and school settings suggests strongly that children will perform better in the language in which they are more proficienct. This includes the production of directives, as a greater range of directives are produced by the six children in the language they are more fluent in. Children who are not as proficient in a language will nevertheless have the receptive competence to understand a wide range of directive forms in their weaker language. Another aspect to note with regard to this study is that the direct imperative is the favored directive type across settings in both Spanish and English, followed by imbedded imperatives. Not surprisingly, there are fewer direct imperatives in the classroom setting than in the informal settings. This study shows that bilingual children are very direct with one another even in the third grade, although evidence of other directive forms in their naturalistic output indicates that some of them, at least, can mitigate their requests if they choose to.

3.0 Methods

3.1 Subjects and Data Source

The primary data for the present study have been the tape-recordings made of two Hispanic children interacting with peers, siblings, teachers, parents, fieldworker, and others in naturally-occurring situations in their homes and schools. The children are from two first generation Mexican families who are participating in the NCBR's ongoing Longitudinal Study of Language Development in Bilingual

Contexts, situated in the greater Los Angeles area. The children are tape-recorded monthly in the home and at school for approximately ninety minutes each visit by a participant-observer who also collects ethnographic information. The recordings are made on a small Aiwa stereo tape recorder (measuring 3" wide, 5" long, and 1" thick, weighing approximately 1 pound), usually affixed by a webbed belt to the child's waist. A great amount of detail of the focal child's speech and the immediate simultaneous and sequential discourse is captured on these recordings, giving an awareness of the immediate negotiated context of the directive (cf. Erickson and Shultz 1977).

In most cases, transcripts of these audiotapes have been made, situational context noted, and surrounding discourse displayed in playscript format in conventional English and Spanish orthographies. In the case of one of the children, the author was the fieldworker; for the other, the usual fieldworker has provided background and contextual information for the analysis.

3.2 Definition of Terms

According to Ervin-Tripp (1977:166-167), adult English speaker have a variety of ways to perform directives, including commands, requests, suggestions, hints, and so on. For the purpose of this study, we adopt Garvey's formulation of this type of act, which she classifies under the label 'request': "The request is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (S) conveys to an addressee (H) that S wishes H to perform an act (A)" (Garvey, 1975:45).

This study of the directives of two bilingual children will focus on directive types as identified by Ervin-Tripp (1977), and illustrated in the naturalistic data from Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan (1977). However, it will be desirable to identify each 'type' with Garvey's classification of direct, indirect, and inferred requests, as each broad categorization requires successively more strategic skills from the speaker and more inferencing skills from the listener. The direct imperative is fairly straightforward in terms of production and interpretation. The indirect requests mention the desired action and doer but are not as linguistically straightforward (as shown in Dore, 1977), while inferred requests may imply but do not state the desired action and doer.[1] In the less linguistically transparent requests, the role of context becomes very important in the interpretation of speaker intent.

---

insert table 1 about here

4.0 Two Case Studies

The two children of interest are both the next-to-last in birth order in families of eight children. Their parents have each come from Mexico knowing little or no English, and use Spanish at home with spouses and children. In each family, the older children have brought English into the home and have exposed their younger siblings to it prior to their own entry into school.[3]

4.1 Case Study 1: TM

The focal child in suburban Los Angeles is TM, born November 9, 1977. Although the community is 76% Spanish-surnamed, according to the 1980 Census, only 59% of the student population at her elementary school use Spanish in the home, and only 31% are limited or non-English speaking. When we first assessed her language abilities at the age of 3;8 in July 1981, she was non-English speaking and non-Spanish speaking, by the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL). When she was assesed a year later prior to entering kindergarten, she was assessed as limited English speaking and limited Spanish speaking by the Language Assessment Scales (LAS).[4]

TM is the seventh of eight children, with five older sisters, one older brother, and one younger brother, who was not yet a year old when we began our observations with the family. Only the eldest girl was born in Mexico; the other children were born in the U.S. The family has lived here for the past 14 years, returning to Northern Mexico only for a few weeks each summer to visit their grandparents. Their father is fluent in Spanish but speaks some English with other construction workers and sometimes at home with his children. Their mother is monolingual in Spanish.

When we first started to record TM, she had not yet entered kindergarten. During the morning, she would speak Spanish with her mother and with her baby brother until her older sisters came home from school beginning at midday. Her sisters would speak English among themselves, and would address TM in Spanish when speaking to her

specifically. But as TM grew and came to be a part of her sisters' play group, she began to speak more English than Spanish.[5] We will consider her use of directives from the age 4;6 in the home context to approximately one year later the age of 5;7, after a complete year in kindergarten.

4.1.1 TM's Directives at 4;6, 4;7: English

We first consider TM's directives at a composite Time 1, consisting of two sessions made one month apart. In the session conducted when TM was 4;6, the participants were the fieldworker, and five of her older sisters. The fieldworker first distributed some gifts (a routine part of each visit) and then took the three youngest girls to their bedroom to direct a structured activity in which large cardboard posters were used to elicit speech. The interaction included the siblings' fighting for rights over the gifts, arguing about turn-taking in the elicitation session, describing the pictures, and discussing topics evoked by the pictures. As Table 2 shows, out of a total of 44 directives, 27, (62%) were the direct imperative, 9 (21%) were indirect, i.e., suggestions or statements of obligation, and the remaining 8 (18%) were utterances which by adult criteria might be classified as inferred requests. The latter included want/need statements, questions, and hints, and often received no verbal acknowledgement which would indicate that the utterance had achieved an intended illocutionary effect (IIE).[6]

---

insert table 2 about here

Direct imperatives. Of the 27 times that TM uses the direct imperative, half (13) are directed to the fieldworker and the other half to her siblings. This apparent lack of sociolinguistic deference to an adult (the fieldworker) is explained by an understanding of the relationships between the participants in the speech situation and the informality of the scene in the home setting.[7] When visits with this family began, TM would not say much when the fieldworker visited. Gradually she saw that the fieldworker allowed her to participate in group activities, and protected her rights to uninterrupted verbal turns in the interaction, which her elder sisters tended to dominate. It is in this role of ally that TM uses the direct imperative with the fieldworker. The example below illustrates this clearly when a sibling tries to comply with a directive made to the fieldworker.

(1)

C2TM[8] Give me that-- Give me that picture right there. (To FWMG)
Not you! (To sib DM) Marilena. Marilena, give me that picture.

FWMG The picture?

C2TM Yeah.

It is important to note that there were often intonational differences that distinguished directives to the fieldworker from those to her sisters. To FWMG, deference would be signalled by the pitch starting at a relatively high level and falling to a lower one. With

directives to her sisters, TM's intonation would be on a more even level, unless she was insistent, in which case the command would be screamed loudly, and the pitch would end at a higher level. TM's use of suprasegmentals there rather than linguistic form to indicate deference may mean that her English language input from her sisters includes native-like intonation models, but not sufficient modeling of deferential forms.

Indirect and inferred. Looking at TM's other directives during this session, it is apparent that the directive is not always grammatical. In these cases, directive force is interpretable from situational knowledge and discourse context. In illustration, consider the following example in which TM's older sister comes into the room to ask that she be told when she could participate in the 'game' that the fieldworker had promised to play with all of them.

(2)
SBAM You said I could play the game. Whatever game you're playing. (To FWMG)
FWMG But it's not--We're not ready for you.
(8 turns later)
SBAM María Elena, send Toni to tell me when you are done.
FWMG Okay.
(One turn, then TM overlaps with second turn)
C2TM We won't tell nobody. We won't tell--We won't tell nobody.
We won't tell nobody, alright? (To FWMG)
FWMG Later. Later we'll do it.

The fieldworker's response does not indicate clearly that the directive force of TM's utterance was correctly interpreted, for she does not acknowledge TM's utterance as a request. The assumption that TM probably would like to continue with the undivided attention of the fieldworker and the fact that the utterance is paraphrasable by: Let's

not tell anybody . . ., supports the directive interpretation.

As for TM's possible inferred directives, only one was heard to elicit a compliant response. The request for information appeared to elicit an action because the addressee's adult status called for the momentary assumption of a caregiver role.

(3)
C2TM What do I have right there, huh?
FWMG Your hair is tangled. (MG fixes her hair.)
C2TM I know. I didn't take a bath last night.

The session recorded one month later (June 1982) was more structured and somewhat less intimate, and therefore shows fewer direct imperatives from TM. Instead, there are instances in which directives are elaborated or embedded within the domain of a preceding request. This session was situated in the family living room, and it was the first time that a companion fieldworker had come to meet the girls. The activity was primarily adult-directed group conversation. The turn taking procedes with very little overlap, which is unusual for the children in the home domain.

Examples of directives from this session show that TM does, in fact, use indirect strategies in English with adults and can participate in elaborate discourse routines with her siblings in English. The following example illustrates TM's sensitivity to FWMG's status as an adult by embedding an imperative in indirect discourse. This contrasts with the use of the direct imperative in her role as friend and ally in the previous visit. Deference is also shown by the

adjunct to the request, which gives a reason for it (i.e., mom might get mad).

(4)

C2TM Don't sit . . . My mom said don't sit that--on that "mesa,"
'cause my mom might get mad.
FWMG Why don't we sit on the floor?
C2TM My brother Rodolfo sit down on the bench and my mom get mad.

The influence that her sisters are having on her acquisition of directives is inferrable from example (5). The request is initiated by the new fieldworker (FWSP). The siblings then begin to recycle the request so that it becomes a challenge. It can be seen in turns 5 and 10 that one of TM's strategies for participation in the interaction is to repeat the direct imperatives issued by her older sister, DM. However, she alone responds to a directive used as a challenge when VM escalates the discussion in turn 11. Note that TM responds with the appropriate elliptical responses in turns 12 and 14, and comes back quickly by recycling the original directive to VM in 16, accompanied by an explanation (of sorts) as to why she herself can't sing the song. As TM has not begun kindergarten nor had any pre-school experience at this point, and her contact with neighborhood children is limited, we may infer that she has learned these routines and ellipsis rules from similar previous exchanges with her sisters.

(5)

Turn	Speaker	Utterance	Function
1	FWSP	How does the song go, Veronica? Don't you remember? It sounds nice. Sing it.	Preparation Initial Directive
2	C1VM	Who, me?	Q Addressee
3	FWSP	Yeah.	Affirmation

4	SBDM	Hey, open your mouth. Come on. Open your mouth, Veronica.	Recycle
5	C2TM	Hey, open your mouth.	Recycle (Repetition)
6	C1VM	Okay.	Agreement
7	SBDM	You don't remember.	Accusation
8	C1VM	Yes, I do.	Claim Ability
9	SBDM	Then sing it.	Recycle
10	C2TM	Then sing it.	Recycle (Repetition)
11	C1VM	Why don't you sing it!	Redirect
12	C2TM	You!	Redirect
13	C1VM	You!	Redirect
14	C2TM	You first! You first! I can't sing it.	Redirect and Reason
15	C1VM	Ah, you see. You don't know it!	Accusation
16	C2TM	Then sing it! My mom always-- My mom always don't let me go to sleep.[9]	Recycle and Reason
		(Discussion continues briefly.)	

In this discourse segment (5), which starts with a directive from the new fieldworker, TM demonstrates that she not only knows the rules for participation in her sisters' play, but that she can also hold her own in creating the verbal context of what becomes an elaborate challenge routine. This shows sophistication in the rules of English discourse and communicative competence in the home setting with her siblings.

4.1.2 TM's Directives at 4;10: Spanish

We next consider TM three months later in September of 1982 at age 4;10. Her family had just returned from a month's stay in Mexico visiting close relatives who live in Chihuahua. Their young cousins, Spanish language monolinguals, were their playmates during that time. In the session analyzed here, the usual fieldworker introduces another new fieldworker to the girls. The two women accompany TM and her siblings to the backyard where they all sit or lie on a blanket, a very

informal scene. The girls speak Spanish almost exclusively, as they talk about their recent stay in Mexico. TM does not participate as much as her other sisters do in this conversation.

This session (summarized in Table 3) shows that TM's directives in Spanish are not as well formed as they are in English. She uses the indirect request por qué no as well as direct imperatives. Although TM uses both familiar (tú) and formal (ústed) forms, she does not appear to differentiate their use consistently according to addressee. As her directives are few in this session, no explainable pattern emerges. The limitation in the range of her directives, coupled with the grammatical errors she makes, suggest that this may be her weaker language.

---

insert table 3 about here

The vignette shown below in (6) contextualizes several of the indirect requests shown in Table 3 and illustrates the limitations of TM's Spanish. Prior to sequence (6), TM had asked the fieldworker to go to her room to talk. Instead the fieldworkers and girls had a long conversation outdoors, seated on a blanket on the ground. Here, TM re-initiates the topic of going to the bedroom.

(6)
C2TM Porque ( ) vamos a mi cámera (i.e., recámera)?
FWMG Hmm?
C2TM Vamos a mi cámera.
FWMG Vamos a tu recámera? Okay, pero tú tienes que poner--
C2TM Primero vamos a traer el cosa (i.e., game).
FWMG Okay.

C2TM Primero vamos a la cámera cuando me pones eso (i.e., microphone).

The use of the nosotros form of the verb for the request recalls the let's of TM's English directives. However, the simple repetition of this form may be indicative of a limited range of directives in Spanish. Despite her linguistic limitations, her directives work because of the familiarity of the participants and their shared knowledge of the established pattern of the visits. The sessions are usually conducted in the girls' bedroom; this one was begun outside because of the nice weather. The cosa (game) has been mentioned in prior discourse by the fieldworker and is also a usual feature of the sessions. TM's requests are clearly based on a prior pattern or 'script' for the visits, and the fieldworker's request to TM that she put on the microphone is correctly anticipated.

Evidence for TM's use of directives in Spanish at the age of 5;1 comes from another home recording. TM is at home after her school day shortly after 12 noon. The fieldworker is not present. She speaks with her mother, eldest sister, and uncle, primarily in Spanish, but does not issue them any directives. Later, the fieldworker arrives, bringing gifts of some play-dough and a jigsaw puzzle. TM, her ten-year-old sister and two-year-old brother play with these new items in the girls' bedroom. TM uses Spanish directives with her younger brother while playing with the play-dough. TM and her older sister (at home with a cold), speak almost exclusively in English. All of the directives in Table 4 are made to her brother. As most of TM's

directives are context-embedded, the verbs in her utterances are often omitted.

---

insert table 4 about here

Her effective use of Spanish directives in this context-embedded situation illustrate that communicative competence need not depend on elaborate linguistic routines. The younger age of her interlocutor, their sibling relationship, and the type of play activity obviously enter into her greater communicative competence in this situation. However, one suspects that the asymetry of the power relationship between herself and her younger sibling may contribute to a narrow range of directive strategies for her in Spanish.

4.1.3 TM's Directive at 5;7: English

When TM entered kindergarten she preferred English use to Spanish. She was very reluctant to speak in class at first, according to her bilingual teacher. Consequently, data on TM's use of directives in the school setting is scant during her first few months of kindergarten. However, by the end of the year, she was speaking and playing more with her classmates, although she still had definite preferences as to who she would speak with.

At age 5;7 during the last month of kindergarten, TM's directives can be accounted for by the participant structure of a cut and paste activity. The students have cut out letters of the alphabet

from a dittoed sheet, and now must paste them on to another sheet. The teacher's aide is charged with helping the students complete the task and so responds to statements of need. She stands near the table overseeing the activity. The children are free to talk with one another and to engage each other's help. TM does not engage anyone directly, but makes statements which are responded to as requests if heard by the aide, and can be responded to or ignored if heard by other students. The examples in (7) are TM's inferred requests in this activity to which no verbal response was obtained:

(7)
I'm missing one more.
I'm missing one after this one.
I'm missing this one. I already got this one.

As the fieldworker is sitting very close to TM, she, too, becomes engaged in the activity. TM's inferred requests in (8) appeal to the fieldworker because her status as adult friend and her role in the classroom as TM's observer.

(8)
C2TM Uh-uh. This is not mines. I already got this one. I'm missing one.
FWMG Which one?
C2TM This one. After this one. *pause* 'E.' I'm missing the 'E.'

TM also engages the aide directly to help her, as in example (9):

(9)
C2TM Teacher, where I'm gonna get the 'W'?
AIDE (Possibly not having heard) Finished, Tonita?
C2TM No. I gotta get-- I need the 'G'.
AIDE Here. Use this one. (I'll find you one.)

The help that TM gets from the adults immediately around her is of low personal cost to her, i.e., entails no obligation to reciprocate,

because of their usual care-giving roles and because they are not a part of TM's peer group.

In another example of communicative competence in English, TM uses an indirect request with a table-mate, whom she has admitted to the fieldworker that she doesn't like.

(10)
C2TM Lonnie. Lonnie. Do you got one of those things after this one? Two of them. You getting mines, Lonnie.
LON *inaudible*
C2TM Nuh-uh. You getting mines.

In example (10) TM's use of an accusation is effective as an inferred request for Lonnie not to get her letters any more. Although not completely grammatical, the accusation you getting mines has the effect of a directive, allows her to remain aloof, and avoids the personal risk of refusal which is a contingency of a direct request. Further, TM can and does maintain the upper hand by recycling the accusation after Lonnie's response. The fact that the grammatical errors are relatively minor may contribute to its pragmatic effectiveness. That is, the errors in lexical selection (got vs. have) lack of auxiliary (you getting . . .) and overgeneralization of possive s (mines) do not impede her accusation/directive from being an effective speech act.

Personal cost is also a factor in TM's lack of a directive to a classmate during this same activity. TM needs the paste, which is at the center of the table close to Christina and out of her own easy reach. TM tries to enlist the fieldworker's help in getting the paste,

even though it is for everyone's use and does not "belong" to any one person.

(11)
C2TM Psst; Marilena;
FWMG (Doesn't hear her.)
C2TM *Whispering* (I need the paste.)
C2TM *Whispering* (I need the paste.)
FWMG Oh, You need the paste? Well, why don't you ask for it? Ask Christina for it. Ask her.
C2TM Uh-uh.
FWMG Why are you so shy all of a sudden?
C2TM Because she's--Because I don't--Because she's not my friend.
FWMG Well, that's alright. Ask her.
C2TM (No response.)
FWMG You have to.
(No response.)
FWMG I'm not gonna ask her.
C2TM (Action: Reaches over across the table and gets it herself.)

In (11), the fieldworker was engaged as an adult ally but refused to make the request for TM. Evidently, asking the peer for the paste would have been of great personal cost to TM. To the fieldworker this seemed silly, but to the child it was a very real obstacle to her obtaining the paste.

4.2 RT, Orange County Suburban Site

The focal child at the Orange County site is RT, born November 14, 1976. His school is 74% Hispanic, which reflects the ethnic makeup of the immediate community. When we first assessed his language abilities at the age of 4;8 in July of 1981, he was Functional English Speaking (FES) and Proficient Spanish Speaking (PSS), as tested by the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL). However, a subsequent linguistic overview of these same language samples showed RT to be more productive

in Spanish than in English (García, Veyna-López, et al. 1982:111-119). He was assessed as Non-English Speaking by the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) prior to entry into kindergarten.

Family background. RT is the seventh of eight children, with three older sisters, three older brothers, and one younger brother. The eldest was 14 and the youngest was less than a year old when we first began tape recording him at home. The family is originally from Jalisco, Mexico and alternated between living in California and living there, until 1976. They have lived in California continuously since then. This alternation back and forth between countries has perhaps contributed to the fact that Spanish is used among the children as well as English. The father prefers Spanish, but uses some English at home, while the mother is monolingual in Spanish. The children will at times speak with her in English, but she will remind them that she doesn't understand it.

When we first began our observations of RT, the elder children would speak primarily in English to each other but in Spanish to RT. It was clear that he was still a pampered younger sibling, and his needs were attended to by his six older siblings, especially his sisters. He spoke Spanish more frequently than English at home during the first year we visited, and when he used English, it was not as fluent nor as grammatically correct as his Spanish.

4.2.1 RT's Directives at age 4;9: Spanish

Time 1 for RT is during one of his first few weeks in kindergarten at the age of 4;9. This session includes seat work and

group activities in the classroom, and recess on the playground. The participants are RT's classmates, an aide, and his teacher in the classroom setting, and other children on the playground. During this session, there are 28 utterances which are directive in function (see Table 5). Of this number, 20 (74%) are in the imperative mood, including only one in English. All imperatives in Spanish were in the familiar tú form, which, with the exception of one addressed to the fieldworker, were addressed to peers and were linguistically well-formed.[10] Of the six indirect examples, the three with poder 'be able to' most closely resembled English in meaning and function. The example in the you will functional category was not uttered with rising intonation, and so was ambiguous; it was either a request or a command which was made to his adult fieldworker. An utterance which made use of the first person plural periphrastic future, no lo vamos a quebrar = 'let's not break it, we shouldn't break it,' appeared to function like let's in English as a request not to touch the recorder. It is notable that at 4;9 years old RT also used the subjunctive as one of the his indirect strategies for directives, because of the complexities inherent in the subjunctive form.

---

insert table 5 about here

One extended example (12) which provides evidence for RT's grasp of inferred requests takes place in the classroom with the male

teacher's aide. As this happens toward the beginning of the new school year, the aide does not yet know the names of all of the children in his classroom. This interchange clearly shows RT's effective use of the inferred request and general discourse competence in the subsequent moves as a means to getting the folder. He embeds his initial question to the aide (turn 1) in a matrix verb of remembering. Even though the embedding is not completely grammatical, the effect is to elicit the search for the folder and to obtain it.

(12)

Turn		Utterance	Function
1	C2RT	¿Acuerdas hallaste mi "folder" aquí?	Initial request
2	AIDE	Cómo?	Request clarification
3	C2RT	¿Acuerdas hallaste mi "folder" aquí?	Clarification/Repetition
4	AIDE	¿Cómo te llamas?	Request information
5	C2RT	Raulito.	Information response
6	AIDE	Raulito. Ahorita te lo busco. Raulito.	Acknowledgement
7	C2RT	Este es el mío. Este.	Collaboration (i.e, identification of folder)
8	AIDE	Es este? Aquí.	Resolution

We may have a better understanding of how the initial request in (12) achieves its end by considering its internal structure. The domain of this request begins with the inferred request by RT in turn 1. Turn 1 prompts the request for clarification made in turn 2, which is an optional move in the role structure of requests (Garvey, 1975;45). Turn 3 clarifies the request, and turns 4 and 5 succeed in transferring information essential for compliance. The acknowledgement in turn 5 serves the function of confirming that the speaker has recognized the intended illocutionary force as directive. At this

point in the discourse, compliance is already assumed, as the aide's role in the classroom is to cooperate with the students in learning-related tasks, and because compliance has been foreshadowed in turn 4 by his request for more information. He can be heard to shuffle through papers after this acknowledgement. RT cooperates with the identification of his own folder (turn 7). The aide ends the sequence (turn 8) with a request for confirmation that the correct folder has been found and his task is complete. He responds to the directive force of RT's initial "hint" by handing over the folder to him with Aquí, "here it is ."

From this bit of cooperative discourse, we can see that RT uses Spanish linguistically and sociolinguistically appropriately in an inferred request to a person of high status. He and the aide have performed cooperatively in a directive discourse which has allowed RT to find his own folder by appealing to the person with distribution rights to the folders.

4.2.2 RT's Directives at age 5;3: English

At the second sample point, RT has been in kindergarten for seven months and is now 5;3. The setting is the family living room, with five of his six siblings and the usual fieldworker as participants. The activities include casual conversation, a game of pool played on the children's toy pool table, play with some plastic cowboy and Indian figures, and play with a paint-by numbers toy. Throughout the one-hour session RT tries to speak English, following his brother's and sister's lead. During this time, he uses 27 direct

imperatives, 10 indirect requests, and 3 possible inferred requests. Only two indirect and one inferred request are in Spanish. All of the direct imperatives are addressed to his siblings. Table 6 shows these directives.

---

insert table 6 about here

As with TM in the personal setting, RT uses the direct imperative in two-thirds of all cases. Although input from siblings has been bilingual for both children there are more ungrammatical directives for him in English than for her. He uses the direct imperative as his older siblings do, to ask for objects and to regulate action pertaining to the game, e.g., Give me it. His use of more indirect strategies is illustrated below in (13).

(13)
C2RT You wanna play, like you have to get one and you have to get 'seis'? I wanna play that one.
SBTT Play eight balls. It's much faster.
C2RT Okay.

Here RT uses the inferred and indirect forms as strategies by which he can show a preference without risking the direct refusal of an imperative. His birth order status as the seventh of eight children has apparently made him cautious about being too forceful with his siblings. All of RT's indirect requests in the "suggestions" category are addressed to his siblings. Furthermore, none of his direct imperatives have as their topic changing the nature of the activity as

his suggestions do. Indirect requests and other inferred requests are also used with the adult fieldworker, showing appropriate deference to her stutus as an adult.

4.2.3 RT at Age 6;1: Spanish

Our last look at RT is at age 6;1 on the playground after school with his peers. The recorder has been left with RT on the playground as he awaits the end of his brother's school day before walking home. Other boys on the playground ask RT about the recorder and say dirty words into it; RT fends them off verbally. Later in the 45-minute session, a woman--the mother of one of the school children--brings some puppies to the playground that she wants to give away. In the course of this session, RT uses Spanish to try to wheedle a pencil from a friend and uses English in attempting to get a puppy from the woman.

In the first episode (14), a friend of RT's has appeared on the playground with four brand-new pencils. RT tries to see if he can acquire one or two for himself. There are 28 turns of the discourse that involve negotiation for the pencils, which all fall under the domain of the initial request, i.e., those turns from the time of the initial request to its resolution (cf. Garvey, 1975:49). What is presented here are those turns which directly express the request, turns which recycle it, and those which provide final resolution for it.

This particular request is unusual in terms of its very boldness; RT is asking his friend for a very high-cost favor (personal

goods), and for which there is no obligation on the part of the friend to grant.

(14)

Recycling of request for pencils, RT, age 6;1

Turn No.	Directive/Request	Function
1	¿Me das una? ¿Me das dos y tú dos?	Initial Directive
3	Un, pero, ¿me das una tuya? Me das una tuya, ¿sí? Yo soy tu mejor amigo y puedes hablar aquí. Hable.	Recycle Offer
9	¿Me das una tuya? ¿Me das una?	Recycle (Rep)
10	¿Me das una tuya?	Recycle (Rep)
12	Andele.	Request Substitute
18	Ay, vas a ver. Andale. Soy tu mejor amigo.	Recycle a) Threat b) Req. Substitute c) Status reminder
20	Andale.	Request Substitute
26	Pero dile que te dé uno--Dame--Dámelo ahorita y te dejo hablar dos veces, ¿eh?	Direct Recycle
28	Ay, tú. Eres un--un deste ¿cómo se llame? Ya no--Ya no te voy a dejar que me copies. (Topic changes)	Resolution of Cycle Name calling Favors withdrawn

OUTCOME: RT does not get a pencil from his friend.

*A Request Substitute is used here to mean a phrase which substitutes for the initial directive, and in itself does not contain the request. It serves as an anaphoric PRO form which depends on context for its interpretation in that discourse segment.

Rep=Repetition

It is interesting that RT uses the present tense verb form das seven times in the first four moves (turns 1, 3, 9, 10) of his initial request. They can be translated as, will you although Spanish does not use a modal verb in this construction and there is no subject auxiliary

inversion in Spanish questions. In Turn 3, the same utterance is used once as a question, and once as a suggestion with a question tag. Although RT uses the familiar tú in speaking to his friend, he uses the polite usted form when he offers him the recorder to speak into as a favor in return (hable). Intonation is also a factor in mitigating the boldness of the request and the relative forthrightness of the linguistic form. The intonation of the PRO-form of the directive, ándale, "come on" also becomes more wheedling the more it is recycled. It appears that familiarity supercedes politeness as RT opts for the imperative of the familiar form in 18, 20, 26 and 28. However, the juxtaposition of the directive with an offer to let his friend speak twice on his tape recorder, plus the use of the question tag, mitigates the dámelo in 26, making it a suggestion rather than a demand. The negative outcome of the request has RT resorting to name calling and withdrawing a special favor in retalliation.

It is an attestation to RT's sociolinguistic and strategic competence that he can recycle the request so many times and yet maintain the upper hand in the interaction. (Incidentally, near the end, his friend attempts conciliation by offering to show RT where to buy the pencils himself when he has a quarter.) This uncanny sense of how far he can go with his friend, coupled with his obvious linguistic competence, shows off his communicative competence in Spanish.

In contrast, his linguistic abilities in English are not up to the level of his demonstrated sociolinguistic competence in Spanish and so he is at a disadvantage in a situation that arises later on the

playground. Some of the children on the playground are heard speaking with the mother of one of their classmates, who has brought some puppies to find homes for them. RT puts in a bid for one of the dogs by saying, "That one I want," but is evidently not heard by the woman, as she is negotiating with another boy on the same topic. RT recycles this request four times, using variations such as, "I wanted that," and "I wanted this dog," all of which are ignored before he gives up temporarily. The woman continues to talk with the other children while RT fends off boys who want to talk into the recorder. Finally, the woman appears to notice that RT is wearing the apparatus, and asks what it is. RT takes the opportunity to make his request, in (15) below.

(15)
Woman ¿Qué pasó? ¿Qué es esto?
C2RT Uh?
Woman What's that?
C2RT I want this dog.
Woman You can have this one. (Indicating another dog.)
C2RT Uh?
Woman You can have that one.
C2RT Could I have it?[11]
Woman If your mom will let you keep it.
C2RT She let me (sic).
Woman Uh?
C2RT She lets me. I wanna keep this one.
Woman This one I'm not--is not for sale, but that one you can have.
C2RT Okay.
Woman But you have to ask your mom first. Where do you live?
C2RT She lets me.
Woman Yeah, you have to ask your mom.
C2RT She lets me.
Woman She'll let you keep it?
C2RT Yeah.

Seconds later, RT says, "I wanted this dog," to which the woman responds with "Umm-hmm," apparently ignoring the directive force of his

hint that she reconsider the one that was not for sale. A few turns later, RT again hints that he would have liked the dog he initially requested:

(16)
C2RT That dog is neat. I wanted it for sale. How come you have--How come you bring the dogs?
Woman Because they like to go for a ride.
C2RT The other one too?
Woman Umm-hmm.

The woman again ignores RT's hint, and he does not repeat it again.

It is clear from these two vignettes, one requesting pencils and the other requesting a dog, that RT is linguistically much more adept in Spanish than in English. That is, sentence-level errors are evident in the English language vignette, while they are absent in the one in Spanish. He uses third person-s variably with the verb (let/lets), and he uses present tense bring for brought. In contrast, he commands both tu and usted forms for the positive commands, as well as the subjunctive form (. . . copies) in Spanish. He is possibly even at a stage when he is overgeneralizing rules for the subjunctive, as shown by the use of llame in the question, ¿cómo se llame? (What is it called?). However, his sociolinguistic skills in each language appear to be appropriate to each speech situation, even though strategically he is more varied in the Spanish discourse with his friend than in the English discourse with the mother a schoolchild. The fact that he was dealing with a familiar peer in the first instance may have contributed to his use of more forceful verbal strategies in Spanish. The fact that he was speaking with an unfamiliar adult in the second instance must have played a role in his use of inferred requests in English.

5.0 Concluding Discussion

The primary purpose of this study has been to explore the range of linguistic and sociolinguistic devices in the dual language resources of two Hispanic bilingual children in an effort to illuminate the components of their communicative competence in both languages.

The communicative competence of RT and TM has been shown to be different in each of their two languages primarily because of their linguistic limitations in the weaker language. On the level of linguistic competence, observable in sentence-level grammar, e.g., morphology, lexicon, syntax, TM shows herself to be more capable in English than in Spanish, from examples in Tables 2, 3, and 4. While there are still errors in her English grammar, they may prove to be more similar to those of monolingual English language learners than to bilingual learners with heavy interference from a first language. RT, on the other hand, shows greater linguistic competence in Spanish, as illustrated in the relatively error-free utterances in the examples in Table 5 and the discourse moves in (14), in contrast to the greater errors in English morphology in the examples in Table 6.

On the level of discourse competence, both TM and RT have show themselves to be learning the discourse rules of the language that they have a better grammatical command of. TM shows that she knows the appropriate types of moves to make in the challenge routine with her sisters in example (5), and uses the rules of ellipsis in English to make her challenge more forcefully. RT shows an awareness of the appropriate moves of the request role structure as he requests a folder

from his teacher in example 12) and when he tries to wheedle a pencil from a friend in example (14). In their weaker languages, some discourse competence is displayed, but not to the same extent, as when TM issues a request to a familiar adult fieldworker in example (6) and when RT tries to obtain a puppy from a schoolmate's mother in (15). Although in each of those cases, the variable of the adult addressee could be an issue, it is important to note that there were no examples of extended discourse of the children using their non-preferred language with peers. One possible reason for this may be that in those situations the children tended to choose the language that they were the most comfortable in. One must point to the fact that, in these interactions with adults, in which the discourse called for more verbal elaboration, very little was produced. The situation in which TM was able to use Spanish effectively was with her baby brother, using minimal linguistic resources, i.e., no and the negative direct imperative of a few verbs.

The aspect of communicative competence which Canale and Swain call strategic competence appears to depend on individual coping abilities. Although Canale and Swain suggest that strategic competence refers primarily to those verbal and nonverbal strategies which compensate for breakdowns in communication (p. 30), this study of directives points to the need for a broader definition. The data from these bilingual children suggest that stragetic competence for directive speech acts may also involve the ability and willingness of the speaker to recycle his request, changing the linguistic form that subsequent requests take

on, for example, ándele for RT in example (14), and the other types of speech acts which are employed to attain the goal of the initial directive, such as threats, e.g., RT's ay, vas a ver, and offers, e.g., . . . puedes hablar aquí. Lack of strategic competence is not to be assumed in the absence of directive strategies in certain performance situations, however. The fact that TM chose not to request the glue from another classmate need not mean that she does not have social and verbal coping strategies; in fact, the strategy of appealing to the adult fieldworker was used, although unsuccessfully. Other coping strategies that she might have used on her sisters in the home setting were not displayed in this situation with a peer.

Directive forms and strategies. It has been shown that studies of monolingual English speaking children demonstrate a wide range of directive forms prior to entry into kindergarten (James, 1978; Read & Cherry, 1978; Bock & Hornsby, 1978); however, it is the conclusion of Wilkinson, Calculator & Dollaghan (1982), as well as Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan (1977), that children in elementary school grades do not have the adult communicative competence in English in the use of those forms. For bilingual children, Walters (1978; 1981) and Rodriguez-Brown and Elías-Olivares (1981) show that school-aged children know a range of directive forms in both English and Spanish. Their results with regard to the production of English language directive forms indicate that bilingual Hispanic children know the same directive types as monolingual English speaking children, and that there are parallels to those types in Spanish. Data from the present study appear to

support the conclusion that bilingual children know a range of directive forms by the age of six. However, as very little is known about the communicative competence of bilingual Hispanic adults with regard to directives, conclusions must be suspended on that point.

To help illuminate the nature of the linguistic resources that the two bilingual children bring to bear on their communicative competence in each language, we will examine briefly the directive forms used by the two children in the present study in English, as well as how the children's use of directive types compares across their two languages.

Earlier in this paper, the labels for different directive types suggested by Ervin-Tripp for adult speakers of English was displayed and compared with Garvey's three categories for requests. Between the two children, all of the request types identified by Ervin-Tripp were found. Examples are given in Table 7.

---

insert table 7 about here

From this display it is possible to say that the two bilingual children whose production of directives have been examined between the ages of 4;6 and 6;1 demonstrate many of the range of directive types in English as have been claimed for middle class, monolingual English speaking pre-school children. It is interesting to note that one of these children was assessed as limited English speaking and the other non-English speaking prior to entry into kindergarten. Unlike the low English proficiency children in the Rodriguez-Brown & Elías-Olivares

study, the opinion of researchers and teachers in the present study would raise the proficiency level of these two children by one level, i.e., TM as functional and RT as limited English speaking during their kindergarten year.

Possibly because of the high frequency of other children as interlocutors, there was no use of "please" or por favor, or other politeness markers in the children's production of directives, consistent with the observation made by Wilkinson, et al., that children tend to opt for directness rather than politeness when dealing with other children. The fact that the direct imperative is also found to be the highest frequency in monolingual children (Garvey, 1975; Read & Cherry, 1978; Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan, 1977), as well as with bilingual children (Rodriguez-Brown and Elías-Olivares, 1981), would seem to corroborate this viewpoint. In the present study, sessions which feature the two focal children interacting primarily with other children in English or Spanish show a very high frequency in the use of the direct imperative (see Tables 2, 5, and 6). The use of indirect and inferred strategies are shown to be employed with adults or with other children when special consideration is desired. The fact that these two children for the most part show deference to adults by altering the form of their request is consistent with the experimental results of Bock and Hornsby (1978). They do not appear to use their directives with adults or children as a form of power play, as indicated for bidialectal Black children by Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan (1977).

In dealing with the question of how the resources of these two children compare across languages, it can be seen be seen that the more direct the request, the closer are the formal correspondences between English and Spanish. Furthermore, in sessions with extensive use of directives, the direct imperative is clearly used more frequently than other types in both languages. Both children show knowledge of both the tú (informal) and usted (formal) imperative forms, but it appears that TM, with very little Spanish language input from her siblings, does not use them systematically, while RT, who uses more Spanish at home, uses the tú form correctly in both the positive and negative constructions. Neither child uses the usted form to a great extent in the data presented here. The indirect requests show parallels in terms of various function-oriented subcategories, and, in some cases, take the same linguistic form. The similarities are shown in Table 8. The effective use of inferred directives in the data seems to depend on well-defined participant structure roles, defined in terms of who is in charge, who the helpers are, and who has the right to receive help.

---

insert table 8 about here

To probe a bit more deeply into the question of the linguistic resources in English and Spanish of these two children, we compare the forms illustrated in Table 8 with those that Walters found for the 7 and 12 year olds in his study. Walters reported the following

directive types in his data which had equivalents in Spanish and English: 1) you have to/tiene que; 2) imperative/imperative; 3) where/donde; 4) you + V/ usted tiene; 5) Do (e.g., you want)/quiere; 6) may/nos deja; 7) if/si; 8) we can + V /podemos; 9) can you/puede; 10) can I/me puede. He also reported one strategy that was elicited in Spanish but not in English, i.e., negative + modal + infinitive, as in, No puedes comprar unas galletas? He reported five strategies that were produced in English but not in Spanish; 1) I want + VP, 2) could, 3) will, 4) would, and 5) I came to.

Table 8 illustrates no overlap across languages for TM and RT in terms of forms which were also found in Walters' data. The direct imperative is the only form used in both languages by both of the children. Strategies not found by Walters occur in our data from TM and RT which appear to be equivalent functionally across English and Spanish, although they may have different surface linguistic forms. There are identified and illustrated on the English side of the table as: let's, why don't you, will/would you, sentence with a tag question, embedded reported speech, and other types of embedded sentences. It is suggested here that the latter are equivalent in both languages at the deep structure level, and are realized in slightly different surface structures. For example, TM's directive, "My mom said don't sit on that mesa," correcting for embedding of direct discourse, might be realized by the same type of matrix sentence introducing a subjunctive dependent clause: Mi mamá me dijo que nadie se sentara en esa mesa. That this linguistic complexity may be part of

the linguistic competence of Spanish-speaking children is illustrated by RT's use of the subjunctive in a similar embedding (type 7 in Table 8).

In accounting for these two bilingual children's use of inferred requests, equivalences across linguistic form in the two languages are not as important as the childrens' sociolinguistic and strategic compentence in the speech situation. As we have seen, possible inferred requests may take on any number of linguistic forms. Their function in the speech situation depends on the situational variables that are present at the time. Linguistically, they offer the participants the option of not responding to the utterance as a directive.

Communicative performance. Data from RT and TM appear to corroborate that a distinction should be made between communicative competence and performance, as proposed by Canale and Swain. It appears that certain situational variables operate differently for children, and may mask their true communicative competence in any given interaction. The setting of the request per se seems to be less important than the individual's perception of self vis-a-vis other participants in the speech situation. The home setting, while a very informal one, operates differently for each of these children. For TM, it is an environment in which she can be verbally aggressive with her older sisters in English (Table 2, and example 5) and with her younger brother in Spanish (Table 4). For RT, it is a setting in which he

shows caution against being too aggressive in stating his preferences for a change of play activity, as in example 13 and Table 6.

Similarly, the school setting affects each of the children's requesting behavior differently. For TM, inferred requests get the attention of the adult participants in a school task, but TM's refusal to make direct requests of classmates she doesn't like indicates the personal cost that she associates with directive speech acts to peers. On the other hand, RT's assurred command of the discourse in which he makes repeated attempts to get a pencil from a friend (example 14), indicates that risk of rejection is not of great importance, and the personal cost to him is low.

Consistent with the observations of Rodriguez-Brown and Elías-Olivares, incomplete linguistic competence in the language used for directives does not appear to affect the understanding of directives by the addressee moreover, the present study suggests that the more linguistically proficient the child is, the more effective his or her participation is in directive discourse, as in TM's challenge routine in English (example 15), and RT's pencil requesting discourse in Spanish (example 14). Both RT and TM have undisputed skill, i.e., competence, in directive discourse, but their performance in such situations is influenced by the setting, participants, their status vis-a-vis the addressee, and their linguistic proficiency. Hence, their communicative performance in certain situations does not match their true communicative competence, and a distinction must be maintained between the two notions.

Implications for research and education. And, finally, what does this mean for future research on the Spanish and English of bilingual children? This work has identified some of the linguistic correspondences between Spanish and English, and has shown them to be functionally comparable; the more direct the force, the closer is the correspondence in linguistic form as well. Future work needs to probe for the range of directive forms that are part of bilingual children's everyday sociolinguistic repertoire so that language teaching needs at the functional/communicational level can be identified. While naturalistic data gives an unparalled view of how children actually use their linguistic resources, experimental probing can give us a better idea of the breadth of the resource. For example, the gaps in Table 8 need to be filled in, such as young bilingual children's receptive and productive competence in such directive formulas as: tener que, necesitar que, querer que, and so on in Spanish, and such as Can/could you do X, or, Why don't you do X in English.

Future research in the area of speech acts--directives being one category--can contribute greatly to our understanding of where miscommunications happen in a second language, and can provide knowledge to avert them. In the absence of information on the use of speech acts in a second language, second language teaching cannot effectively ensure communicative competence as a goal. Research on directives and other types of speech acts used in daily life can be used as input to syllabus planning in second language teaching.

As the literature has shown, monolingual English-speaking children tend to favor directness over politeness in issuing directives. Their approximation to adult norms of politeness depends on adult role models and socialization in the home, presumably by adults, to the rules for appriate behavior with regard to socially sensitive speech acts. Spanish-speaking children learning English, however, interact most frequently with other children in their community and in their schools. For many of these children, the English of their peers will be the model for their own acquisition of form and function in the language, as the adults in the home are usually monolingual in Spanish. Teachers, while they also serve as models for English language use by example, may need to be more explicit in teaching the sociolinguistic skills involved in using the English language as part of their second language teaching.

Footnotes

[1]This framework procedes from the performative analysis of formal linguistics, and from speech act theory of the philosophy of language (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), and is summarized in Garvey (1975, 44-47).

[2]While Garvey's formula excluded the possibility of proposals for joint action by the speaker and hearer, which would eliminate Let's, it was decided to include this type of directive in this study as it appears to be simply another suggestion form for the directive.

[3]Another paper (García, 1983) discusses the topic of the influence of siblings in the children's acquisition of speech acts for these two children.

[4]The picture description task of the BINL was administered to the children in this study in order to elicit both the stronger and weaker language of the children. TM's score at the age of 3;8 was doubtlessly not a true measure of language ability, as the test is normed on a slightly older population. Her scores on the LAS a year later supported her placement in a bilingual kindergarten; however, the Spanish version of this test does not allow for Spanish dialectal variation. As the Fall of that school year progressed, the teacher commented on the fact that she preferred English to Spanish in that setting (Fieldnotes, 1982).

[5]A more detailed picture of her early days at home her family is found in García, Veyna-López, Siguenza and Torres (1982:34-38). This report also contains samples of both children's speech, i.e., TM and RT, at the time they began the study.

[6]The intended illocutionary effect for directives (IIE) is for the hearer to understand that a request has been made. A request/directive which is understood and complied with has achieved its intended perlocutionary effect (IPE) as well as its intended illocutionary effect. The IPE is also known as 'uptake' of the speech act (cf. also Garvey, 1975:47).

[7]Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan make distinctions based on prior work by Ervin-Tripp (1976), on the types of role relationships found in transactional work settings versus those found in family settings, and the directives likely to occur in each. Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan find in data from children's role playing that personal (i.e., family) situations yield a high percentage of directives (80%) that are imperative in form (1977:194). When the status of addressee was considered, 71% of the imperatives in personal situations were found to be used by speakers of equal rank. In the sibling and peer situations described here for TM and RT, the percentages roughly match those in Mitchell-Kernan and Kernan's data.

[8]The abbreviations used here to identify speakers are as follows. The last two letters are the speaker identification code; the first two initials indicate the role relationship of the speaker to the focal child, i.e., C2 = younger focal child; SB = sibling; FW = fieldworker.

Occasionally a 3 or 4-character label will indicate a person in the immediate context who does not have a recurring role in the study. Parentheses indicate 'best guesses' about partially audible words.

[9]The topic of singing a specific song arose from immediately prior discourse. It is the theme song of a children's movie that the girls had recently watched on television. TM is apparently trying to argue that she didn't have the opportunity to learn the song as her mother did not let her stay up to watch all of the movie, but did let older sisters stay up.

[10]The command form for tú requires the use of the third person singular, e.g., habla, canta, etc. However, there are a handful of very common verbs which are irregular in the familiar command form, for example: haz 'make', di 'tell', pon 'put', ten 'take', etc. The negative tú forms require the third person subjunctive verb form with an -s suffix: no lo hagas 'don't make/do it', no le digas 'don't tell him/her', no lo pongas 'don't put it', no hables 'don't speak', etc. The usted form is relatively simple by comparison, requiring the same third person subjunctive form for positive and negative commands.

[11]Language elicitation done with California school-age children at SWRL in the 1970's (Robert Berdan, personal communication), and with bilingual adolescents in 1981 in the Los Angeles area (Benji Wald, personal communication), indicates that could is a common variant for the modal can in both positive and negative contexts. The could used here is probably not a politeness form, but simply this variant.

References

Austin, J. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bock, J. K., & Hornsby, M. E. (1978). The development of directives: How children ask and tell. Journal of Child Language, 8, 151-163.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

Carrasco, R., Vera, A., & Cazden, C. (1981). Aspects of bilingual students' communicative competence in the classroom: A case study. In R. Duran (Ed.), Latino Language and Communicative Behavior. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Campbell, R., & Wales, R. (1970). The study of language acquisition. In J. Lyons (Ed.), New Horizons in Linguistics. Harondsworth, English: Penguin.

Dore, J. (1977). "Oh, them sheriff." A pragmatic analysis of Children's responses to questions. In S. Ervin-Tripp and C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), Child Discourse. New York: Academic Press, 139-163.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1977). When is a context? The Quarterly Newsletter for Comparative Human Development, 1(2), 5-10.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil There? The structure of some American English directives. Language in Society, 7, 357-373.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1977). Wait for me, roller skate! In S. Ervin-Tripp and C. Mitchell-Kernan, (Ed.), Child Discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Fantini, A. E. (1976). Language acquisition of a bilingual child: A sociolinguistic perspective. Putney, VT: Experiment Press.

_____. (1978). Bilingual behavior and social clues: Case studies of two bilingual children. In M. Paradis (Ed.), Aspects of Bilingualism. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.

Fraser, B., Rintell, F., & Walters, J. (1980). An approach to competence in a second language. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research (75-91). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

García, M. (1980). Linguistic proficiency: How bilingual discourse can show that a child has it. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.), Theory in Bilingual Education (Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education II). Eastern Michigan University: Bilingual Bicultural Education Programs.

García, M. (1983). The role of siblings in the acquistion of L2 speech acts. Paper presented at the Second Language Research Forum, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

García, M., Veyna-López, A., Siguenza, C., & Torres, M. (1982). Baseline data report of the Spanish-English longitudinal study (R-10). Los Alamitos, CA: National Center for Bilingual Research.

García, M., & Leone, E. (1983). The acquisition of English and Spanish directives: Two case studies. Paper presented at the conference, El Español de los Estados Unidos IV: La Investigación Comprometida, Hunter College, N.Y.

Garvey, C. (1975). Requests and responses in children's speech. Journal of Child Language, 2, 41-63.

Genishi, C. (1976). Rules for code-switching in young Spanish-English speakers: An exploratory study of language socialization. Doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Herbert, C. H. (1979). Basic Inventory of Natural Language, Instructions Manual (rev. ed.). San Bernardino, CA: Checpoint Systems, Inc.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride and J. Holms (Eds.), Sociolinguistics. Harmandsworth, England: Penguin.

James, S. (1978). Effect of listener age and situation on the politeness of children's directives. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, (Vol. 7, No. 4), 307-317.

McClure, E. (1977). Aspects of code-switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children. In M. Saville-Troike (Ed.), Linguistics and Anthropology. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

McClure, E. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the code-switched discourse of bilingual children. In. R. Duran (Ed.), Latino Language and Communicative Behavior. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mitchell-Kernan, & Kernan, C. K. (1977). Pragmatics of directive choice among children. In S. Ervin-Tripp and C. Mitchell-Kernan, (Eds.), Child discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Narvaez, D. (1981). Sharing social meaning in the bilingual classroom: A study of requests. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, April 1981. Los Angeles, California.

Olmedo-Williams, I. (1981). Functions of code-switching in Spanish-English bilingual classroom. Bilingual Education Paper Series 4, No. 11. Los Angeles, CA: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, CSULA.

Read, B. K., & Cherry, L. (1978). Preschool children's production of directive forms. Discourse Processes, I, 233-245.

Rodriguez-Brown, F. & Elías-Olivares, L. (1981). Bilingual Children's Home and School Language: An Ethnographic-Sociolinguistic Perspective (Final Report). Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.

Searle, J. (1969). Speech acts. London: Cambridge University Press.

Walters, J. (1978). Variations of language use in the language acquisition of bilingual children. Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University, Massachusetts.

Walters, J. (1981). Variation in the requesting behavior of bilingual children. International Journal of the sociology of language, 27, 77-92.

Wilkinson, L. C., & Calculator, S. (1980). Effective and Appropriate Requests in First-Grade Reading Groups (Technical Report). Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Wilkinson, L. C., Calculator, S., & Dollaghan, S. (1982). "Ya wana trade--just for a while." Children's requests and responses to peers. Discourse Processes, 5, 161-176.

Wilkinson, L. C., & F. Spinelli. (1981). Third grade Children's Use of Requests and Responses (Technical Report). Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Zentella, A. C. (1978). Code-switching and interactions among Puerto Rican children. Sociolinguistic Working Paper 50. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Zentella, A. C. (1981). Ta bien. You could answer me en cualquier idioma. In R. Duran (Ed.), Latino Language and Communicative Behavior. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Table 1

Comparison of Garvey's and Ervin-Tripp's Directive Categories

Garvey	Ervin-Tripp	Example
DIRECT REQUESTS	Imperatives	Put your books away.
INDIRECT REQUESTS	Imbedded imperatives	Could you erase the board? Would you open the door?
	Permission directives	May I have a match? Can I have it quiet, please?
	Suggestions	Let's do it quietly.[2] Why don't you use the blue one?
INFERRED REQUESTS	Question directives	Is Sybil there?
	Hints	It's cold in here. Houses are usually white. I don't want to see any paper on the floor.
	Need/want statement	I need a penny.

Table 2

TM's English Requests at Age 4;6

TM May 13, 1982, Age; 4;6 — n = 44

DIRECT (27) 62%

Direct imperatives

Put my books over there.
Put this in my folder.
Save my folder.
Give me my folders right there.
Give me that picture right there.
Marilena, give me that picture.
And leave my folder alone!
Tell her to shut up.
Veronica, show me that big one.
Dalia, give me a water.
Pick that up.
Now put that one right there.
(Put that one right there.)
Give me it!
Put it over there next to those pictures.
Put these in there and that picture over there.
Take those over there.
Give me that book!
Put it more closer.
Stay here. Stay here. Stay here.
Get off my bed. Get off my bed!
Let me see. Let me see. Let me see that one.

INDIRECT (9) 21%

Suggestions (w/Let's)

Let's use this one first.
Let's do a better one.
Let's go.
We won't tell nobody. We won't tell nobody. We won't tell nobody, alright? (=Let's not tell . . .)

Obligation

Veronica, have to read this one.
You have to read this one.
You have to read this one.

INFERRED (POSSIBLE = 8) 18%

Want/Need Statements

I want this one.
I think I need--want--need it.
I (want to put) my book in there.
I like to put my book in there.
I like to put my book in there.

Hints

I can't even find that picture.
I can't put this on.

Questions

What do I have right there?

Table 3

TM's Use of Spanish Directives at 4;10

TM Sept. 30, 1982; Age 4;10

DIRECT REQUESTS

Direct imperatives
Trae eso porque está pesado.* (said to FWMG)
Píntelo aquí.* (said to sibling)
Déjalo.

INDIRECT REQUESTS

Por qué no
Por qué no van (i.e., vamos) en la recámera del mía?
Por qué ( ) vamos a mi cámera? (See larger context below.)

Suggestions
Cambiamos en la cámera (i.e., recamera) de nosotros.
Vamos a mi cámera.
Primero vamos a traer el (sic) cosa.
Primero vamos a la recámera cuando me pones eso (i.e., microphone).

---

*Indicates inappropriate form for addressee, i.e., formal form to intimate or familiar form to an adult.

Table 4

TM's use of Spanish Directives at 5;1

TM December 10, 1982; Age 5;1

No lo abres. No lo abres, Raulito. No, Raulito.
No, Raulito, no.
No, Raulito. Estas no. ¡No,no,no,no,no,no,no!
No. Lo voy a usar.
Así no, Raulito. Mira. Así.
No, Raulito.
Look, estos, Raulito. Estos, no.
Estos no, Raulito. ¡Esos no! Azucena--Es pa jugar--Es pa
Azucena, no es pa--

Table 5

RT's Spanish Directives at Age 4;9

RT, August 28, 1983, Age 4;9 — n = 28

DIRECT (20) 72%

Es una cosa, no la quebres.
No, no apachurres nada.
No taches.
Ya, sientate ahí.*
Ahorita, quítate. Quítate.
Echate el brinco. Echatelo.
Echatelo. Echatelo. Echate. el brinco. Echatelo el brinco. Andale. Echatelo, o si no, no vas a ser mi amigo.
Préstamelo.
Déjanos y te lo doy.
Téntale.
Póntelos en tu bolsa. .
Oye, deja.
Get in line, Herbert.

INDIRECT (6) 21%

You will
Oyes, y luego me los prestas a mi ese.

Can you
Tú puedes hacer esto? (said twice)
Tú puedes hacer este? Mira.

Let's (we)
Es una cosa de (ardite) por que ya no lo vamos a quebrar esto.

Subjunctive
Es una cosa bien importante que no la quebre (sic).

INFERRED (2) 7%
Acuerdas hallaste mi folder aquí? (said twice)

Table 6

RT's English Requests at Age 5;3

RT, Febrary 9, 1982, Age 5;3 — n = 40

DIRECT (27) = 67%

Imperative

Antonio, bring it.
Tell me.
Move, Lourdes.
play. Let's play.
Hey, give me mine.
Hey, give me mine.
Put it over here for I can't lose it.
Hey, give me mine. That one over there.
Okay, give me my cowboy.
Hey, give me it.
Get this out.
Give me the marble!
Give me it.
Watch me.
You better watch me.
Javier, go.
Give me it.
Okay, then give me again.
Give me another and get that one (off).
Get it.
Hey, give me mine.
No. You color this one.
There, now give me my paint.
Give me my paint.
Give me my paint.
Open all.
Hey, give the--
Hey, give me a (toalla).

INFERRED (3) = 8%

I wanna play that one.
Teacher, where do I get mine?
I wanna say a story.

INDIRECT (10) = 25%

Let's

Toño, let's

Let's play again.
Let's see.
Now, let's start.
Let's see.

Suggestions

And we have to hide.
You're don't gonna help him, okay?
And you're not gonna help him, okay, Miguel?
Only you're the Indians and I'm the cowboys because the cowboys are good.

Will/Would you

Take it off? (With Q intonation)

Why not/Por qué no?

¿Por qué no los quitamos?
Teacher, ¿por qué no los quitamos?

Table 7

Directive Types Displayed by RT and TM in English

Garvey	Ervin-Tripp	Example from RT or TM
DIRECT	Imperative	Put my books over there. (TM, 4;6) Get in line, Herbert. (RT, 4;9)
INDIRECT	Imbedded Imperatives	Take it off? (RT, 4;9)*
	Permission directives	Could I have it? (RT, 6;1)
	Suggestions	Let's use this one first (TM, 4;6) Let's play again. (RT, 5;3)
		And you're not gonna help him, okay, Miguel? (RT, 5;3) We won't tell nobody, alright? (TM, 4;6)
INFERRED	Question directives	What do I have right there? (TM, 4;6) Teacher, where do I get mine? (RT, 5;3)
	Hints	I'm missing this one. (TM, 5;7) I can't put this on. (TM, 4;6)
	Need/want statements	I need the 'G'. (TM, 5;7) I wanna play that one. (RT, 5;3)

*This is a tentative assignment, as no imbedding verb was heard The mitigation which is the function of the imbedding was conveyed by the question intonation.

Table 8

Sample English and Spanish Directive Function Correspondences*

Type	English	Example	Spanish	Example
		SUGGESTION		
1	Let's	Let's do a better one. We won't tell nobody.	-mos	Cambiamos a mi (re)camara.
2	Why don't you, why not	(not found)	Por qué no	Por qué no los quitamos.
		OBLIGATION		
3	Have to	You have to read this one.	Tener que	(not found)
		WILLINGNESS		
4	Will/Would you	( ) Take it off?	Present tense verb with future meaning	Me das una tuya?
5	Future with tag	You're not gonna help him, okay?	Present tense with tag	Me das una tuya, si?
		EMBEDDED COMMANDS		
6	Embedded Reported Speech	My mom said don't sit on that mesa...	Embedded Reported speech	(Possible but not found)
7	Other Embedding	(Possible but not found)	Embedding with subjunctive	Es una cosa bien importante que no la quiebre.

*Taken from data for RT and TM, ages 4;5 to 6;1.

Participants	Order	Structural Function
S and H	Ia	Preparation of propositional content
S	Ib	Adjunct to request
S	II	Request
H and S	III	Clarification
H	IV	Acknowledgement of II
(S)	(II)	(Request may be repeated if IV is not a compliant acknowledgement.)
S	V	Acknowledgement of IV

Figure 1. Garvey's role structure for requests.

	Classroom - English		Classroom - Spanish	
	n	%	n	%
Need Statements	13	13.9%	0	0
Imperatives	59	63.4%	27	69.2%
Imbedded Imperatives	16	17.2%	10	25.6%
Permission Directives	2	2.1%	0	0
Question Directives	0	0	1	2.5%
Hints	3	3.2%	1	2.5%

Figure 2: Directives used in English and Spanish in the classroom by six eight-year-old Hispanic children.

	Informal - English		Informal - Spanish	
Need Statements	2	1.7%	1	.3%
Imperatives	96	83.5%	194	74.9%
Imbedded Imperatives	13	11.3%	56	21.6%
Permission Directives	0	0	0	0
Question Directives	2	1.7%	5	1.9%
Hints	2	1.7%	3	1.1%

Figure 3: Directives used in English and Spanish in informal settings by six eight-year-old Hispanic children.